

Exploring LLM-based Student Simulation for Metacognitive Cultivation

Haoxuan Li¹, Jifan Yu¹, Xin Cong¹, Yang Dang¹,
Yisi Zhan¹, Huiqin Liu¹, Zhiyuan Liu¹
¹Tsinghua University

Abstract

Metacognitive education plays a crucial role in cultivating students' self-regulation and reflective thinking, providing essential support for those with learning difficulties through academic advising. Simulating students with insufficient learning capabilities using large language models offers a promising approach to refining pedagogical methods without ethical concerns. However, existing simulations often fail to authentically represent students' learning struggles and face challenges in evaluation due to the lack of reliable metrics and ethical constraints in data collection. To address these issues, we propose a pipeline for automatically generating and filtering high-quality simulated student agents. Our approach leverages a two-round automated scoring system validated by human experts and employs a score propagation module to obtain more consistent scores across the student graph. Experimental results demonstrate that our pipeline efficiently identifies high-quality student agents, and we discuss the traits that influence the simulation's effectiveness. By simulating students with varying degrees of learning difficulties, our work paves the way for broader applications in personalized learning and educational assessment.

1 Introduction

As is famously quoted by Joseph Addison "*What sculpture is to a block of marble, education is to the human soul*", it emphasizes the transformative power of education in shaping individuals. Generations of educators have contributed to cultivating and "polishing" students' abilities to enhance their metacognitive skills, i.e., the skills about learning how to learn, rather than just transmitting specific knowledge (Tanner, 2012). Research indicates that well-developed metacognitive abilities are linked to improved learning outcomes (Schraw and Moshman, 1995; Silver et al., 2023). To date, increasing attention has been devoted to their development

beyond the implicit cultivation of these metacognitive skills in daily instructional activities. This has even led to the establishment of specialized *Academic Advising* discipline, aiming at supporting students who encounter learning difficulties. However, this crucial domain continues to face an inherent challenge: while such interventions are beneficial, relying on real-world student participants to experiment with instructional methods risks unintended consequences. Such studies may inadvertently expose participants to psychological distress, privacy breaches, or academic disadvantages (Burns et al., 2008; Doody, 2018). Instead, simulating such "raw" students—who still require targeted support—can offer educators valuable insights into refining their pedagogical approaches without ethical concerns.

Large language models (LLMs) have recently been increasingly employed as human simulators in the social sciences (Gao et al., 2024). By replicating human behaviors (Qian et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023), decision-making processes (Park et al., 2023), and social interactions (Qian et al., 2024; Chan et al., 2023; Hong et al., 2023), LLM-based simulations enable researchers to conduct studies that would otherwise require extensive data collection or large-scale experiments (Wang et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024a). The success encourages a promising approach for studying academic advising by simulating student with LLM-based agents. Although some researchers have attempted to simulate students based on problem-solving behaviors (Ma et al., 2024; Lu and Wang, 2024) or dialogue interactions (Markel et al., 2023), incorporating meta-cognitive abilities remains a challenge.

Numerous technical obstacles need to be explored to effectively simulate "raw" students with insufficient learning capabilities. First, large language models (LLMs) are inherently optimized for generating correct answers and factual responses,




 Student Profile (traits)	 LLM Scorer (up: score chat log, down: evaluation)	 Human Experts
MBTI ISTJ Big Five Conscientiousness Low Big Five Description Conscientiousness Easily distracted from the learning tasks Study Questionnaire Easily distracted in class? No Self-Regulation I feel a lot of pressure in my daily studying. Agree Motivation I keep working on a problem until I understand it. Strongly disagree ...	LLM Scorer: (Questioning profile conflicts) As an ISTJ, you are typically organized and detail-oriented, but your profile indicates low conscientiousness . How do you manage your studies with these conflicting traits? Agent Student: (Explaining conflicts) I try to create structured environments that help me stay organized. I use tools like planners... . While I may get distracted, having a routine helps me refocus. LLM Score: 7/10 The agent provides coherent explanations ... The agent acknowledges her low conscientiousness but describes using structured environments to manage distractions, aligning with her ISTJ type. Meanwhile, the only slight inconsistency between agent behavior and profile shown in conversation is the lack of any obvious signs of pressure...	Human Experts: (Interviewing) Do you get stressed about your studies? Agent Student: (Answering) Yes, I do feel some pressure when it comes to studying However, I usually try to adopt some study strategies to relieve stress, such as making a study plan If you have any suggestions on how I can better cope with study stress , I would greatly appreciate it! Score: 4/10 , Agreement on LLM: 2/5 The scorer didn't notice this obvious contradiction about his tendency to be distracted from tasks and "No" distraction in class . The student shows in the communication that she is active in learning and solving the problem , not as written in the profile.

Figure 1: Evaluation of Agent Student’s Authenticity Using a Q&A. We use colored words to present traits from the profile in the dialogue. The LLM Scorer identified some inconsistencies but deemed the agent’s explanations reasonable. However, human experts concluded that the Agent’s behavior deviated from the profile (colored in red).

making it difficult for them to exhibit genuine confusion or the typical struggles of real learners. Most existing student simulations are knowledge-based interactions, such as question answering in specific subjects, leaving aside critical aspects of learning strategies and metacognitive development. Consequently, these simulations often fail to represent students who experience genuine learning difficulties authentically. Second, evaluating simulation realism remains resource-intensive. Current methods require substantial expert annotation to validate student authenticity. An alternative approach involves using LLMs to serve as judges or evaluators, yet this approach risks introducing biases. As shown in Figure 1, the LLM scorer detected certain inconsistencies, but found the agent’s explanations plausible, while, on the contrary, human experts determined that the agent’s behavior exhibited deviations from the profile. Third, as mentioned above, collecting real-world data raises ethical concerns, making it impractical to evaluate or pre-train models by real data.

To address these challenges, we present a pipeline to automatically generate many simulated student agents and efficiently filter high-quality candidates, shown in Figure 2. The pipeline begins by generating numerous random student profiles under minimal rule constraints. These profiles are then subjected to two rounds of automated

scoring, assessing profile consistency and behavior consistency, and a subset of these scores is validated through limited human expert annotations. To fully leverage agent profile content and their latent relationships, we employ a graph neural network sub-module to propagate the scores across the student graph constructed by profile similarity embedded by a sentence encoder. Finally, candidates are ranked and filtered based on the propagated scores, resulting in a set of student agents with high consistency in profile content and alignment between behavior and profile. The contributions of our work are as follows,

- We extend LLM-based student simulation to the domain of metacognition, enabling the modeling of learning difficulties and providing empirical insights for personalized learning and pedagogical evaluation.
- We propose a novel pipeline for generating and filtering high-quality simulated students, reducing the reliance on human annotations.
- We conduct comprehensive experiments that demonstrate our pipeline’s effectiveness and analyze key patterns influencing the quality of simulated students.

2 Related Work

Due to space limitations, we provide a more comprehensive discussion in the Appendix A.




Figure 2: The pipeline automates the generation and selection of high-quality simulated student agents. It begins with random profile generation, followed by two rounds of automated scoring for profile and behavior consistency, partially validated by human experts. A graph module propagates scores across a student similarity graph constructed via a sentence encoder. Candidates are ranked and filtered based on propagated scores and finally selected by human experts through real academic advising test.

2.1 LLM-based Human Simulation

LLMs have been increasingly used to simulate human behaviors across various domains, including social interactions (Gao et al., 2023; Qian et al., 2024), economic decision-making (Horton, 2023; Zhao et al., 2023), and physical mobility (Jin et al., 2023; Zou et al., 2023). Additionally, studies have explored hybrid models (Park et al., 2023; Williams et al., 2023) and medical simulations (Du et al., 2024). However, little work has been done on simulating students in academic advising.

2.2 Student Simulation in Education

LLMs have been leveraged to simulate students for educational purposes, such as training teaching assistants (Markel et al., 2023), modeling student profiles (Lu and Wang, 2024), and generating personality-driven student agents (Liu et al., 2024; Jin et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2024). However, simulating students with discrepancies in knowledge or learning skills remains unexplored.

3 Student Simulation Pipeline

3.1 Student profile Setting

Simulating authentic "raw" students is pivotal for developing and evaluating academic tutoring, where direct collection of real-world data is impractical or ethically constrained. Therefore, we leverage prompt-based LLMs to simulate students with virtual profiles $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N\}$ by random generation. As shown in Figure 3, these profiles integrate (1) demographic information, (2) psychological traits derived from established frame-



Figure 3: Student profiles include demographic information and other questionnaires related to studying. Detailed profile is provided in Appendix C

works (MBTI, Big Five (De Raad, 2000)), (3) self-reported learning challenges (e.g., material understanding difficulties, anxiety), and (4) motivational factors including goal commitment and emotional states. The attribute selection aligns with guidelines (Gordon et al., 2011; Folsom et al., 2015) and empirical survey data from real educational contexts (Ma et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024), ensuring ecological validity while addressing ethical data collection constraints, providing a comprehensive representation of a real student’s characteristics.

However, randomly generated profiles may inherently contain internal contradictions and inconsistencies or exhibit low credibility, thereby undermining their utility for realistic simulations. For example, a profile might simultaneously indicate a high proficiency in mathematics while also de-

cribing a severe aversion to engaging in mathematical tasks. We then introduce a pipeline designed to automatically generate a substantial number of simulated student agents and efficiently filter high-quality candidates. The pipeline initiates with the random generation of student profiles constrained by a minimal set of predefined rules, limiting the difference in Likert scale agreement of the same trait to no more than one point,

$$\begin{aligned} Trait_i &= (T_i^1, T_i^2, \dots, T_i^M), \\ |T_i^k - T_i^\ell| &\leq d_{\max}, \forall k, \ell \in \mathcal{I}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \dots, M\}$ indexes traits subject to this difference limit, and $d_{\max} = 1$. The profiles are then randomly sampled from this constrained space to avoid obvious contradictions.

3.2 Two Round Scoring

Subsequently, each profile undergoes two phases of automated scoring. The first scoring phase assesses profile consistency (S_p), wherein each profile is evaluated for internal logical coherence. The second phase examines behavioral consistency (S_b), ensuring the simulated behaviors align with the profile attributes.

3.2.1 Profile Consistency Scoring

This phase assesses the consistency of the profile (S_p), where a **Questioning Agent** Q is introduced to identify potential contradictions or ambiguities by asking questions.

Let $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N\}$ be the set of all student profiles under evaluation. Each profile p_i includes demographic attributes and background information. Q_i is the set of potential conflict points generated by a **Questioning Agent** Q for p_i , and let R_i be the set of corresponding responses the student agent provides. A **Profile Scorer** ρ_p then produces a consistency score $S_p(p_i)$ and an explanation $E_p(p_i)$ with a scoring instruction Θ_p :

$$S_p(p_i), E_p(p_i) = \rho_p(\Theta_p; p_i, Q_i, R_i). \quad (2)$$

A higher $S_p(p_i)$ indicates stronger internal coherence, implying that R_i resolves or justifies more conflicts within p_i .

3.2.2 Behavioral Consistency Scoring

In the second phase, we evaluate behavioral consistency (S_b) to ensure that the behaviors exhibited by each student agent during interactions are consistent with profile attributes.

We engaged each agent in a conversation with a **Dialogue Agent**, where the **Student Agent** is prompted with various open-ended topics, subtly encouraging the student to reveal information about their profile, traits, and learning strategies. Let D_i be the set of conversation turns recorded for p_i . A **Behavior Scorer** ρ_b then produces a behavior consistency score $S_b(p_i)$ and an explanation $E_b(p_i)$ with a scoring instruction Θ_b :

$$S_b(p_i), E_b(p_i) = \rho_b(\Theta_b; p_i, D_i). \quad (3)$$

A higher $S_b(p_i)$ signifies greater alignment between the agent’s interactive behavior and the attributes defined in its profile p_i . In practice, we set the turns of conversations to 15.

3.3 Graph-Based Score Propagation

To effectively capture the semantic content of individual profiles and their latent interrelationships, we employ a graph neural network module (You et al., 2020) to propagate scores across a similarity-based graph structure. We first employ a sentence encoder ϕ to derive normalized embeddings \mathbf{e}_i for each profile p_i .

$$\phi: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \mathbf{u}_i = \phi(p_i), \mathbf{e}_i = \frac{\mathbf{u}_i}{\|\mathbf{u}_i\|_2} \quad (4)$$

These embeddings facilitate the construction of a student similarity graph $G = (V, E)$, where each node corresponds to a profile, and edges E are established based on a similarity threshold θ . For simplicity, we employ bge-m3 (Chen et al., 2024), one of the state-of-art encoders among benchmarks. The adjacency matrix is formulated as,

$$A_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (p_i, p_j) \in E \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Leveraging this graph structure, we integrate a propagation module to spread consistency scores across the network. Specifically, the initial scores $\mathbf{S}^{(0)}$ are iteratively updated as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}^{(0)} &= [S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N]^T \\ \tilde{\mathbf{A}} &= \mathbf{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \mathbf{S}^{(k+1)} &= \alpha \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{S}^{(k)} + (1 - \alpha) \mathbf{S}^{(0)}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where \mathbf{D} denotes the diagonal matrix of \mathbf{A} . k denotes the iteration step. We set α to 0.5 for simplification. This propagation allows for the refinement of scores by considering the influence of similar profiles within the graph.

Table 1: Overall performance of the agent ranking pipeline under various scoring strategies. We compare the initial and propagated phases using profile score (S_p), behavior score (S_b), and their average, evaluated with Precision@K, NDCG@K, and Pairwise Accuracy for $K = 5$ and $K = |\mathcal{C}|$.

Score	Phase	K=5			K= C		
		Prec.	NDCG	Pair Acc.	Prec.	NDCG	Pair Acc.
S_p	Init	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0634
	Prop	0.2	0.3664	0.1	0.4615	0.3695	0.0771
S_b	Init	0.0	0.0787	0.3	0.1538	0.0999	0.0559
	Prop	0.4	0.4200	0.2	0.4615	0.3858	0.0777
Avg(S_p, S_b)	Init	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2308	0.1021	0.0670
	Prop	0.4	0.4200	0.2	0.4615	0.3866	0.0775

3.4 Interactive Test

After score propagation, profiles are ranked and filtered based on their propagated scores $S_p^{(K)}$, $S_b^{(K)}$ after K iterations, resulting in a curated set of candidate students exhibiting high consistency in both profile content and behavioral alignment. In practice, we constrain this curated set to those student agents \mathcal{C} whose scores are higher than 8 out of 10.

Finally, we conduct the interactive evaluation, engaging candidate student agents in multi-turn dialogues with academic advising experts. Each expert conducts a minimum of 15 conversational turns with an assigned agent while referencing its predefined profile. Annotators score profile conformity (1-100 scale) and provide justifications based on observed interactions. The annotation interface integrates agent profiles, real-time chat functionality, and evaluation metrics. Tutors initiate sessions by diagnosing academic challenges through open-ended questioning, then progressively apply intervention strategies from the academic support guidelines from guide books (Gordon et al., 2011; Folsom et al., 2015), and finally evaluate the performance of student agents. More detailed information of experts and annotation instructions are provided in Appendix B.

The whole pipeline ensures that the generated student agents not only adhere to logical consistency within their profiles but also exhibit behaviors that are coherent and aligned with their defined attributes, thereby facilitating effective simulations in educational contexts.

4 Experiments

We conducted a series of experiments and formulated several research questions to validate the proposed pipeline for selecting simulated student agents, investigate the roles of individual modules within the pipeline, and identify noteworthy phenomena during the selection process. We provided

detailed experimental settings and configurations of agents in Appendix B.

4.1 Pipeline Performances

RQ1: *How does the ranking of agents selected through the full pipeline compare to expert rankings in the interactive test?*

To analyze the extent to which the pipeline effectively selects agents aligned with expert preferences, we examine rankings derived from different scoring phases at various stages of the pipeline. In particular, we consider the profile score, the behavior score, and their average, evaluated at both the initial (S_p, S_b) and propagated phases ($S_p^{(K)}, S_b^{(K)}$). The rankings are compared using three metrics—Precision@K, NDCG@K, and Pairwise Accuracy—with K set to 5 and to the total number of agents selected ($|\mathcal{C}|$). For all metrics, the higher the value, the more aligned to the human preferences. We elaborate on the metrics in Appendix B.2.

Table 1 reports the ranking performance using different scores throughout the pipeline. The results reveal that scores computed in the initial scoring stage yield poor filtering performance across all metrics. In contrast, the average of S_p and S_b consistently improves the selection quality. Moreover, despite propagation improving top-K precision and NDCG, pairwise accuracy shows minimal gains (< 0.02 absolute improvement) between phases. It indicates that while propagation enhances absolute ranking positions, it preserves most relative agent pairwise relationships established during the two round scoring phase. The marginal improvement implies limited success in correcting initial rankings of pairwise agents through propagation.

4.2 Score Propagation Validation

RQ2: *To what extent does the score propagation correct the initial scores?*




Figure 4: The figure illustrates the distribution of key profile features of student agents before and after the pipeline filtering process. "BF-TC" represents the Big Five personality traits (O: Openness, C: Conscientiousness, E: Extraversion, A: Agreeableness, and N: Neuroticism). Other questionnaire items are labeled by their respective question numbers. The Four Trait Questionnaire subscales are distributed as follows: top-left (goal commitment), bottom-left (motivation), top-right (self-efficacy), and bottom-right (self-regulation).




Figure 5: The distributions of the initial (green), propagated (orange), and human scores (blue). Propagated scores are more aligned with that of human scores.

To validate the efficacy of the graph-based score propagation mechanism, we perform comparative analyses between the raw automated scores, the propagated scores, and the average human expert scores. Formally, let $\bar{S}_{\text{expert}}(p_i)$ denote the average score assigned by human experts for the student agent with profile p_i .

As illustrated in Figure 5, we present the distribution of scores for all simulated student agents in both the initial and propagated stages, along with the distribution of human expert scores using violin plots. The score distribution after propagation aligns more closely with the human experts' score distribution. Notably, the propagated profile scores exhibit a top-heavy distribution mirroring that of human annotations, whereas human behavior scores display an inverse bottom-heavy pattern. This divergence suggests that the propagation module helps the pipeline better align with human ex-

Table 2: Mean Absolute Error comparison of initial and propagated scores compared to human scores.

MAE	Init	Propagated	Improv
Δ_{profile}	1.007	0.6988	+30.63%
Δ_{behavior}	1.6942	0.8453	+50.11%

perts on profile consistency evaluation than behavior consistency evaluation.

We then quantitatively measure the differences between $S^{(K)}(p_i)$ and the average experts' scores $\bar{S}_{\text{expert}}(p_i)$ using Mean Absolute Error (MAE). The results in Table 2 also demonstrate that the propagated scores have a reduced MAE with expert scores compared to the initial automated scores, thereby validating the effectiveness of the graph-based propagation mechanism. Specifically, the profile MAE Δ_{profile} decreases from 1.007 to 0.6988, reflecting a 30.63% improvement. Similarly, the behavior MAE Δ_{behavior} reduces from 1.6942 to 0.8453 with a 50.11% improvement. These findings highlight the complementary strengths of LLMs and graph-based propagation. While LLMs provide assessments for explicit profile features, they require structural regularization through relational graphs to handle implicit relationships.

4.3 Agent Profile Distribution

RQ3: How does the distribution of profile traits shift throughout the pipeline?

Figure 4 illustrates the distribution of key pro-




Figure 6: Relative importance ranking of traits in profile, with those under the same level categorized by colors.

file features of student agents before and after the pipeline filtering process. The initial distribution appears uniform, with minor differences across features. However, most feature distributions exhibit noticeable shifts in the final selected agents.

Among the Big Five personality traits, agents with low extraversion and high agreeableness are more prevalent in the final selection. It is because high extraversion often indicates strong energy and positivity, which may not align well with typical characteristics of students experiencing learning difficulties. In contrast, high agreeableness is more frequently observed, as agents tend to exhibit affirmative responses, making agents with high agreeableness more likely to receive higher alignment scores. For the study questionnaire, q2 (*Do you have trouble taking tests or completing assignments?*) shows a significantly higher proportion of "Yes" responses in the selected agents. It suggests that LLM-based student simulations better capture students with such difficulties, aligning with real-world academic advising practices where these challenges are common. Notably, in the four trait questionnaire, the proportion of agents with strong self-efficacy and self-regulation increases substantially after filtering. It is because agents inherently display high self-efficacy and structured planning abilities in conversations, even though these traits may not typically align with students facing learning difficulties. Nevertheless, such agents still achieve high scores in behavior consistency evaluations.

4.4 Influence of Features in Profile

RQ4: *How important are the traits to final scores?*

To investigate the influence of the features in the agent profile on the final profile and behavior scores, we performed a hot encoding of the features of the profile and used a Random Forest model (Breiman, 2001) to fit the propagated profile score and behavior score, where the size of test sets

is 20% and the number of trees is 100. We then ranked the features based on their relative importance (Archer and Kimes, 2008), where the relative importance of each feature is calculated by dividing its importance score by the highest among all.

As shown in Figure 6, the profile features are categorized into five groups, with *BF TC* containing both high-low value-based features and their corresponding descriptive features. **Age** and **MBTI** personality type from the *Basic Information* category have a significant impact on the scores. It indicates that both profile and behavior scorer pay more attention to these two traits when scoring the agents. Additionally, the overall influence of the *Four Trait Questionnaire* is relatively high, with similar importance observed for the descriptive features of *BF TC*. Compared to value-based features, descriptive features provide more detailed information to the scorer, aiding in assessing of the agent’s consistency. Notably, even the most important feature **Age** has a relatively low importance score of 0.0651 and 0.0644 for the profile and behavior scores, respectively. It suggests that individual features have limited influence on the final scores, and the interaction between multiple features plays a more critical and subtle role in determining the outcomes.

4.5 Case Study

RQ5: *Which trait does the LLM prioritize or overlook when evaluating the quality of simulations?*

We showcase LLM scoring examples in Figure 7, comparing a *good case* and a *bad case* in profile and behavior evaluation, accompanied by expert scores, agreement levels, and explanations. In the **good case** (top), the questioning agent *Q* detects an inconsistency in the student’s profile—17 years old while enrolled as a third-year Master’s student. The student agent fails to provide a compelling justification for this contradiction. Additionally, the LLM accurately assesses the student agent’s self-reported academic pressure, where the reasoning behind the discrepancy between daily and long-term pressure is somewhat reasonable. Regarding behavior evaluation, the scorer correctly identifies that the student agent violates the role of being a student who need academic advising. It demonstrates the model’s sensitivity to instruction following and reveals its occasional struggle with adherence to long instructions. In contrast, the **bad case** (bottom) illustrates a scenario where the LLM’s evaluation deviates significantly from human judgment. The agent’s profile presents conflicting traits, such as experi-

Student Profile (traits)	Profile Score Cases (up: score chat log, down: evaluation)	Behavior Score Cases
Age 17 Grade Third-year Master Self-Regulation I feel a lot of pressure in my daily studying. <i>Agree</i> Future education and employment bring me a lot of academic pressure. <i>Disagree</i> Study Questionnaire Do you often feel anxious, stressed or lack confidence in your studies? <i>Often</i>	LLM Scorer: (Questioning the conflicts) 1. You are in the third year of your Master's program; how do you reconcile this with being only 17 years old? 2. You mentioned feeling a lot of pressure in daily studying , yet you disagree that future bring academic pressure . Can you explain this apparent contradiction? Agent Student: (Responding to questions) 1. Being in the third year of my Master's program at 17 is indeed unusual. I accelerated through my education due to a combination of early schooling ... This path allowed me to progress quickly, though it also brings unique challenges ... 2. The pressure in daily studying is more about the immediate tasks and expectations I set for myself. I think it's the day-to-day workload and the desire to meet my own standards that create this pressure, rather than concerns about the future . LLM Score: 4/10 The responses contain several contradictions, and while some explanations are provided, they are not entirely convincing or consistent. For instance, the claim of being in a third-year Master's program at age 17 is not adequately justified. The explanation for feeling daily pressure but not future pressure is somewhat reasonable. Expert Score (Avg): 4.7/10 , Agreement (Avg): 4.3/5 Explanation: The first explanation is not convincing and fully evidenced. Others are reasonable.	Chat Agent: (Asking advice for how to get help) Hi there! I'm considering to get some help to better manage my time and improve myself. What do you suggest? Agent Student: (Giving exact advice about studying) Hi! I'm here to help. It's great that you're taking the initiative to seek out study consultation. There are strategies that can help you manage your time more effectively. Firstly, ...If you often feel anxious like me, having designated time for relaxation or activities you enjoy can help alleviate some of the stress. Would you like more detailed information on any of these strategies? LLM Score: 2/10 The agent in the conversation plays the role of an advisor instead of someone seeking academic help. Additionally, there's no indication of the agent's discomfort about seeking help, which were expected traits. Expert Score (Avg): 3.3/10 , Agreement (Avg): 4.7/5 Explanation: Wrong role instruction following.
BF TC (Value) Description Conscientiousness (low) <i>Struggling to organize answers</i> Self-Efficacy I believe I can learn well in a science course. <i>Disagree</i> Study Questionnaire Do you have trouble taking tests or completing assignments? <i>No</i> Do you often feel anxious, stressed or lack confidence in your studies? <i>Often</i> Do you have difficulty in understanding the study material? <i>Yes</i> Do you actively seek help to solve learning difficulties? <i>No</i>	LLM Scorer: (Questioning the conflicts) 1. You often feel anxious and stressed while studying, but you have no trouble taking tests or completing assignments. Is there a contradiction? 2. You describe yourself as having difficulties in understanding study material, but do not actively seek help to solve your learning difficulties. How do you overcome these difficulties? Agent Student: (Explaining the conflicts) 1. I felt anxious and stressed during my studies, mainly because I was not very confident in my understanding. However, I am usually able to focus and perform well when taking tests or completing assignments , probably because I have a greater sense of purpose and urgency in these situations. 2. Although I do not often actively seek help, I will overcome difficulties by trying out different methods. LLM Score: 4/10 The agent's responses contain several contradictions. For instance, the agent claims to feel anxiety and pressure in their studies, yet they assert they perform well in exams due to focus and goal orientation, which does not align with their profile's disagreeable self-efficacy in science. The agent also mentions not seeking help but using various learning strategies, which is somewhat contradictory but partially explained by self-reliance. Expert Score (Avg): 7.3/10 , Agreement (Avg): 2.3/5 Explanation: Feeling pressured in studies and performing well on a test are not mutually exclusive. Student's lack of confidence causes anxious.	Chat Agent: (Being an academic advisor) Hello! I'm here to help you with your study consultation. Could you tell me a bit about what you're currently studying or any specific goals you have in mind? Agent Student: (Asking for help) Although I sometimes struggle with organizing my study materials and staying focused in class ... Do you have any tips or strategies that might help me with these challenges? Chat Agent: (Giving advice) Absolutely! Here are a few strategies that might help you ... Agent Student: (Ask another detailed question) Those strategies sound really helpful, thank you! I'm particularly interested in improving my organization with summary sheets. ... Do you have any specific advice on how to select the key concepts and formulas effectively? LLM Score: 2/10 The profile suggests that the student has low openness and conscientiousness. However, the conversation shows the student is organized and actively seeking help and advice. All traits indicate higher openness and conscientiousness than described. Furthermore, the student appears to manage academic pressure well, contrasting self-regulation challenges. Expert Score (Avg): 7/10 , Agreement (Avg): 1.7/5 Explanation: It is somewhat passive when the teacher suggests that help can be given before the student asked. The student had problem in organizing sheets and science course, aligning conscientiousness and self-efficacy in profile.

Figure 7: Examples of LLM scoring cases for agent profile and behavior: good case (top) and bad case (bottom). Colored text highlights corresponding features in the profile.

encing stress while reporting no difficulty in tests and assignments. The LLM questions these inconsistencies but assigns a relatively low score due to its strict conflict detection. However, expert annotations suggest that such contradictions are not inherently erroneous, but reflect common real-world cases where students manage stress effectively despite academic challenges. Furthermore, the LLM scorer underperforms behavior evaluation by misinterpreting the agent's conscientiousness and self-efficacy, leading to lower agreement scores with human experts. The results indicate that while LLM scorers is adept at identifying explicit conflicts, it may over-penalize cases where nuanced human explanations exist.

These findings suggest that the LLM tends to overemphasize explicit contradictions while occasionally overlooking the complexity of real-world student behaviors, reflected in certain cases' lower

agreement scores with human experts. Future improvements should focus on enhancing the model's reasoning consistency and refining its instruction-following capabilities to align more closely with expert evaluations.

5 Conclusion

We propose a pipeline for automatically generating and filtering high-quality simulated student agents to improve the authenticity of learning difficulty simulations. Our approach contains a two-round automated scoring phase, validated by human experts to ensure the profile consistency and behavioral alignment of agents. We then employ a score propagation module to enhance consistency across the student graph. Experimental results show that our method effectively identifies high-quality agents, advancing the use of simulated students for broader educational applications.

Limitations

Our work explores the potential of automatically generating and filtering high-quality simulated student agents to enhance the authenticity of learning difficulty simulations. However, researchers and practitioners must consider several limitations and risks. First, our approach focuses on prompt-based student simulation, particularly extending the scope to metacognition. We do not explore more complex agent simulation frameworks like workflow-based or retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) simulations. These approaches will be explored in future work to improve simulation fidelity further. Second, some studies evaluate LLM-based human simulation by Turing tests (Aher et al., 2023), measuring the model’s success rate in mimicking human-like responses. Such evaluations emphasize linguistic style. Our work prioritizes metacognitive abilities and learning limitations in simulation rather than stylistic authenticity. We explicitly addressed this distinction during expert annotation to ensure the evaluation remains aligned with our research objectives. Third, our approach assumes that structured profiles can effectively capture student attributes and learning difficulties. However, real-world learning behaviors are highly dynamic and context-dependent. Future work should explore adaptive modeling techniques that better reflect the evolving nature of student cognition and engagement.

Additionally, ethical risks must be considered. The simulated student agents are generated based on training data, which may introduce biases, stereotypes, or unintended inaccuracies in student representations. These biases could affect the fairness and applicability of educational interventions. Researchers must remain vigilant in mitigating such risks through continuous evaluation, bias detection, and responsible deployment of simulated agents.

References

- Gati V Aher, Rosa I Arriaga, and Adam Tauman Kalai. 2023. Using large language models to simulate multiple humans and replicate human subject studies. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 337–371. PMLR.
- Kellie J Archer and Ryan V Kimes. 2008. Empirical characterization of random forest variable importance measures. *Computational statistics & data analysis*, 52(4):2249–2260.
- Leo Breiman. 2001. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45:5–32.
- Matthew K Burns, Susan Jacob, and Angela R Wagner. 2008. Ethical and legal issues associated with using response-to-intervention to assess learning disabilities. *Journal of School Psychology*, 46(3):263–279.
- Chi-Min Chan, Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Jianxuan Yu, Wei Xue, Shanghang Zhang, Jie Fu, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2023. Chateval: Towards better llm-based evaluators through multi-agent debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07201*.
- Jianlv Chen, Shitao Xiao, Peitian Zhang, Kun Luo, Defu Lian, and Zheng Liu. 2024. Bge m3-embedding: Multi-lingual, multi-functionality, multi-granularity text embeddings through self-knowledge distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03216*.
- Boele De Raad. 2000. *The big five personality factors: the psycholexical approach to personality*. Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- Owen Doody. 2018. Ethical challenges in intellectual disability research. *Mathews Journal of Nursing and Health Care*, 1(1):1–11.
- Zhuoyun Du, Lujie Zheng, Renjun Hu, Yuyang Xu, Xiawei Li, Ying Sun, Wei Chen, Jian Wu, Haolei Cai, and Haohao Ying. 2024. LLMs can simulate standardized patients via agent coevolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.11716*.
- Pat Folsom, Franklin Yoder, and Jennifer E Joslin. 2015. *The new advisor guidebook: Mastering the art of academic advising*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Chen Gao, Xiaochong Lan, Nian Li, Yuan Yuan, Jingtao Ding, Zhilun Zhou, Fengli Xu, and Yong Li. 2024. Large language models empowered agent-based modeling and simulation: A survey and perspectives. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1):1–24.
- Chen Gao, Xiaochong Lan, Zhihong Lu, Jinzhu Mao, Jinghua Piao, Huandong Wang, Depeng Jin, and Yong Li. 2023. S3: Social-network simulation system with large language model-empowered agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.14984*.
- Virginia N Gordon, Wesley R Habley, and Thomas J Grites. 2011. *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sirui Hong, Xiawu Zheng, Jonathan Chen, Yuheng Cheng, Jinlin Wang, Ceyao Zhang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, et al. 2023. Metagpt: Meta programming for multi-agent collaborative framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.00352*.
- John J Horton. 2023. Large language models as simulated economic agents: What can we learn from homo silicus? Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.

- Hyounghwook Jin, Minju Yoo, Jeongeon Park, Yokyung Lee, Xu Wang, and Juho Kim. 2024. Teachtune: Reviewing pedagogical agents against diverse student profiles with simulated students. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04078*.
- Ye Jin, Xiaoxi Shen, Huiling Peng, Xiaoan Liu, Jingli Qin, Jiayang Li, Jintao Xie, Peizhong Gao, Guyue Zhou, and Jiangtao Gong. 2023. Surrealdriver: Designing generative driver agent simulation framework in urban contexts based on large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13193*.
- Terry L Kuhn. 2008. Historical foundations of academic advising.
- Zhengyuan Liu, Stella Xin Yin, Geyu Lin, and Nancy F Chen. 2024. Personality-aware student simulation for conversational intelligent tutoring systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06762*.
- Xinyi Lu and Xu Wang. 2024. Generative students: Using llm-simulated student profiles to support question item evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM Conference on Learning@ Scale*, pages 16–27.
- Yiping Ma, Shiyu Hu, Xuchen Li, Yipei Wang, Shiqing Liu, and Kang Hao Cheong. 2024. Students rather than experts: A new ai for education pipeline to model more human-like and personalised early adolescences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.15701*.
- Julia M Markel, Steven G Opferman, James A Landay, and Chris Piech. 2023. Gpteach: Interactive training with gpt-based students. In *Proceedings of the tenth acm conference on learning@ scale*, pages 226–236.
- MA Miller. 2011. Structuring our conversations: Shifting to four dimensional advising models. *A. Carlstrom & MA Miller (Eds.)*.
- Jeongeon Park, Bryan Min, Kihoon Son, Jean Y Song, Xiaojuan Ma, and Juho Kim. 2023. Choicemates: Supporting unfamiliar online decision-making with multi-agent conversational interactions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01331*.
- Chen Qian, Wei Liu, Hongzhang Liu, Nuo Chen, Yufan Dang, Jiahao Li, Cheng Yang, Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Xin Cong, et al. 2024. Chatdev: Communicative agents for software development. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15174–15186.
- Gregory Schraw and David Moshman. 1995. Metacognitive theories. *Educational psychology review*, 7:351–371.
- Naomi Silver, Matthew Kaplan, Danielle LaVaquemanty, and Deborah Meizlish. 2023. *Using reflection and metacognition to improve student learning: Across the disciplines, across the academy*. Taylor & Francis.
- Kimberly D Tanner. 2012. Promoting student metacognition. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 11(2):113–120.
- Yancheng Wang, Ziyang Jiang, Zheng Chen, Fan Yang, Yingxue Zhou, Eunah Cho, Xing Fan, Xiaojiang Huang, Yanbin Lu, and Yingzhen Yang. 2023. Recmind: Large language model powered agent for recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14296*.
- Ross Williams, Niyousha Hosseinichimeh, Aritra Majumdar, and Navid Ghaffarzadegan. 2023. Epidemic modeling with generative agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04986*.
- Yuzhuang Xu, Shuo Wang, Peng Li, Fuwen Luo, Xiaolong Wang, Weidong Liu, and Yang Liu. 2023. Exploring large language models for communication games: An empirical study on werewolf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04658*.
- Jiaxuan You, Zhitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2020. Design space for graph neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:17009–17021.
- Jifan Yu, Zheyuan Zhang, Daniel Zhang-li, Shangqing Tu, Zhanxin Hao, Rui Miao Li, Haoxuan Li, Yuanjun Wang, Hanming Li, Linlu Gong, et al. 2024. From mooc to maic: Reshaping online teaching and learning through llm-driven agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.03512*.
- An Zhang, Yuxin Chen, Leheng Sheng, Xiang Wang, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2024a. On generative agents in recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 47th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1807–1817.
- Jintian Zhang, Xin Xu, Ningyu Zhang, Ruibo Liu, Bryan Hooi, and Shumin Deng. 2023. Exploring collaboration mechanisms for llm agents: A social psychology view. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02124*.
- Zheyuan Zhang, Daniel Zhang-Li, Jifan Yu, Linlu Gong, Jinchang Zhou, Zhiyuan Liu, Lei Hou, and Juanzi Li. 2024b. Simulating classroom education with llm-empowered agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19226*.
- Qinlin Zhao, Jindong Wang, Yixuan Zhang, Yiqiao Jin, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, and Xing Xie. 2023. Competeai: Understanding the competition behaviors in large language model-based agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17512*.
- Hang Zou, Qiyang Zhao, Lina Bariah, Mehdi Bennis, and Merouane Debbah. 2023. Wireless multi-agent generative ai: From connected intelligence to collective intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02757*.

A Related Work

A.1 LLM-based Human Simulation

Recent studies on human simulation have increasingly leveraged large language models (LLMs) to emulate complex behaviors across social, economic, and physical domains. In the social realm, Gao et al. (2023) and Qian et al. (2024) demonstrated how LLM agents replicate interpersonal interactions and collaboration, enabling realistic group dynamics. From an economic perspective, Horton (2023) and Zhao et al. (2023) showed that LLM-based simulations can capture market behaviors and decision-making patterns aligned with established economic theories. In the physical domain, Jin et al. (2023) and Zou et al. (2023) employed LLM agents to model mobility and driving behaviors in virtual environments, highlighting human-like performance and adaptability. Hybrid approaches further integrate these dimensions, as illustrated by Park et al. (2023) and Williams et al. (2023), showcasing the potential of LLM-driven simulations to generate intricate, multifaceted human-like behavior. In the medical context, Du et al. (2024) introduced EvoPatient, an agent coevolution framework that models simulated patients and doctor agents engaging in multi-turn dialogues. Similar to simulating patients, academic advising, where an institutional representative provides guidance to a college student on academic, social, or personal matters (Kuhn, 2008), helping students maximize their college experience (Miller, 2011). However, to the best of our knowledge, little work explores simulating students in academic advising using LLM.

A.2 Student simulation in Education

The emergence of LLMs has spurred extensive research on simulation at the individual level (Yu et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024b). Markel et al. (2023) uses LLMs to simulate students to train teaching assistants (TAs) for office hours. It categorizes TA-student interactions, performs A/B testing to evaluate system effectiveness, and addresses academic and personal issues like study methods and stress management. Lu and Wang (2024) models student profiles by simulating their responses to multiple-choice questions, predicting their performance, and evaluating their conceptual understanding. It highlights how LLM-based simulations can assist teachers in assessing the quality of their test items. Liu et al. (2024) focuses on creating virtual

students with diverse personality types (e.g., the Big Five or MBTI) to train teachers’ pedagogical skills. Jin et al. (2024) evaluates teaching agents by simulating students with varying traits and knowledge levels, then generating conversations to assess agent responses. Its features resemble debugging tools, enabling real-time agent performance analysis across student profiles. Ma et al. (2024) constructs conversational datasets based on real teacher-student interactions, fine-tuning LLMs to simulate diverse student types in language learning. The virtual students underwent a Turing test, where some personalities closely resembled real humans, benefiting from high-quality, real-student data for fine-tuning. Despite the success they have achieved, simulating students with discrepancies in knowledge or learning skills remains unexplored.

B Experimental Settings

B.1 Settings

B.1.1 Configurations

We set all student agents to use GPT-4o as their backbone and scoring models. All API calls use the default official parameter settings¹. We release the code and prompts for reproducibility².

B.1.2 Annotation Settings

To ensure the reliability of automated scoring and to facilitate interactive testing for simulated students, we recruited a team of experienced experts with strong backgrounds in education from top universities in China. Each expert had at least one semester of experience as a teaching assistant or academic tutor and was compensated at a rate of 60 RMB/hour. All annotations and interactive tests were conducted in English.

In the *profile score* and *behavior score* annotation tasks, we first presented annotators with the entire interaction between the student agent and the scorer, along with the student agent’s profile information. Following the same instructions used by the LLM scorer, annotators evaluated the consistency of the agent’s profile and behavior. After providing their ratings, annotators were shown the LLM scorer’s results and explanations. They then indicated their level of agreement with the LLM scorer’s assessments.

¹<https://platform.openai.com/docs/api-reference/introduction>

²<https://anonymous.4open.science/r/student-simulation-0886>

B.2 Pipeline Performance Metrics

The evaluation of ranking performance relies on three widely used metrics: Precision@K, Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain at K (NDCG@K), and Pairwise Accuracy. These metrics capture different aspects of ranking quality, ensuring a comprehensive assessment of the proposed approach.

Precision@K measures the proportion of relevant agents among the top K positions in the ranking. Formally, it is computed as:

$$\text{Precision@K} = \frac{|r_i \in R_K \cap G|}{K}, \quad (7)$$

where R_K denotes the set of top K agents according to the pipeline ranking, and G represents the set of agents deemed relevant based on expert annotations. A higher Precision@K indicates a greater concentration of relevant agents in the top-ranked positions.

NDCG@K extends the evaluation by incorporating graded relevance, ensuring that highly relevant agents are given more weight when positioned near the top of the ranking. It is defined as:

$$\text{NDCG@K} = \frac{1}{\text{IDCG@K}} \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{2^{\text{rel}(r_i)} - 1}{\log_2(i + 1)}, \quad (8)$$

where $\text{rel}(r_i)$ denotes the relevance score of agent r_i , and IDCG@K represents the maximum possible DCG@K value obtained from an ideal ranking where all agents are perfectly ordered by their relevance scores. The logarithmic discount factor penalizes lower-ranked relevant agents, emphasizing the importance of placing highly relevant agents at the top of the ranking. Higher NDCG@K values indicate rankings that more closely align with the ideal ordering.

Pairwise Accuracy evaluates ranking correctness at the level of agent pairs by comparing the relative ordering produced by the system against the ground-truth order determined by expert annotations. It is given by:

$$\text{Pair Acc.} = \frac{\sum_{(i,j) \in P} \mathbf{1}[(r_i - r_j)(g_i - g_j) > 0]}{|P|}, \quad (9)$$

where P represents the set of all possible agent pairs, and $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ is an indicator function that returns one if the system correctly preserves the relative ordering of a pair and zero otherwise. A higher pairwise accuracy indicates better agreement between the system and expert-annotated rankings.

Basic Info
Age: MBTI
Grade: Major

Big Five Traits
Openness: High / Low
Conscientiousness: High / Low
Extraversion: High / Low
Agreeableness: High / Low
Neuroticism: High / Low

Four Trait Questionnaire (Likert scale agreement)
Goal Commitment
Q1: I am strongly committed to pursuing this goal.
Q2: I think this is a good goal to shoot for.
Q3: I am willing to put forth a great deal of effort beyond what I'd normally do to achieve this goal.
Motivation
Q1: I keep working on a problem until I understand it.
Q2: I try to learn more about something that I don't understand right away so that I will understand it.
Q3: When I know I have learned something new, I feel good inside.
Self Efficacy
Q1: I believe I am the kind of person who is good at science.
Q2: I believe I am the type of person who can do science.
Q3: I believe I can learn well in a science course.
Self Regulation
Q1: I feel a lot of pressure in my daily studying.
Q2: Future education and employment bring me a lot of academic pressure.
Q3: I feel that I have disappointed my parents when my test/exam results are poor.

Study Questionnaire
Q1: Do you have difficulty in understanding the study material?: Yes / No
Q2: Do you have trouble taking tests or completing assignments?: Yes / No
Q3: Are you easily distracted in class or during study hall?: Yes / No
Q4: Do you use certain learning strategies to cope with learning difficulties?: Never / Sometimes / Often
Q5: Do you actively seek help to solve learning difficulties?: Yes / No
Q6: Do you often feel anxious, stressed or lack confidence in your studies?: Never / Sometimes / Often
Q7: Are there any factors other than the content of your studies that affect your learning?: Yes / No

Figure 8: Student profile includes demographic information and other studying-related questionnaires.

Together, these metrics provide a comprehensive evaluation of ranking quality. Precision@K focuses on binary relevance at a fixed cutoff, NDCG@K captures position-sensitive graded relevance, and Pairwise Accuracy measures local ranking consistency.

C Profile Settings

The virtual student profiles are constructed through four demographic attributes and two psychological assessments, as visualized in Figure 8. Demographic components include:

- **Basic Attributes:** Gender, age (17-28 years covering typical undergraduate/graduate student ranges), academic major (62 most prevalent disciplines across Science, Engineering, Social Science and Arts), and academic standing (freshman to third-year master).
- **Psychological Profiles:** MBTI (16 personality types) and Big Five trait compositions with the corresponding descriptions.

Four multi-dimensional questionnaires capture learning characteristics:

- **Learning Traits:** 12 Likert-scale items (1-5 agreement) measuring self-regulation, motivation, engagement, and information processing styles. Each dimension contains three semantically equivalent questions for response consistency verification.
- **Academic Challenges:** 7 common learning obstacles across four domains: cognitive (e.g., material understanding), metacognitive (e.g., learning strategies), social (e.g., seeking for help), and affective (e.g., stress management).