

Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Your Students Dont Use LLMs Like You Wish They Did*

Authors: *Sebastian Kobler, Matthew Clemson, Angela Sun, Jonathan K. Kummerfeld*

How to read the checklist symbols:

- the authors responded 'yes'
- the authors responded 'no'
- the authors indicated that the question does not apply to their work
- the authors did not respond to the checkbox question

For background on the checklist and guidance provided to the authors, see the [Responsible NLP Checklist](#) page at ACL Rolling Review.

A. Questions mandatory for all submissions.

- A1. Did you describe the limitations of your work?

This paper has a Limitations section.

- A2. Did you discuss any potential risks of your work?

Section 8 (Limitations)

B. Did you use or create scientific artifacts? (e.g. code, datasets, models)

- B4. Did you discuss the steps taken to check whether the data that was collected/used contains any information that names or uniquely identifies individual people or offensive content, and the steps taken to protect/anonymize it?

We anonymised the data prior to use as referenced in Section 4.1 Dataset Composition

- B6. Did you report relevant statistics like the number of examples, details of train/test/dev splits, etc. for the data that you used/created?

Sections 45 and Tables 13

C. Did you run computational experiments?

- C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?

Section 4 + weight justification, Table 2, Appendix A.6 (cost analysis)

- C3. Did you report descriptive statistics about your results (e.g., error bars around results, summary statistics from sets of experiments), and is it transparent whether you are reporting the max, mean, etc. or just a single run?

Section 5 and Tables 23

D. Did you use human annotators (e.g., crowdworkers) or research with human subjects?

- D1. Did you report the full text of instructions given to participants, including e.g., screenshots, disclaimers of any risks to participants or annotators, etc.?

(left blank)

The Responsible NLP Checklist used at ACL Rolling Review is adopted from NAACL 2022, with the addition of ACL 2023 question on AI writing assistance and further refinements based on ARR practice. ACL 2026 used a subset of ARR checklist form.

N/A D2. Did you report information about how you recruited (e.g., crowdsourcing platform, students) and paid participants, and discuss if such payment is adequate given the participants' demographic (e.g., country of residence)?
(left blank)

D3. Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating (e.g., did your instructions explain how the data would be used)?
Section 4.1 states that the original data collection obtained appropriate consent from students for educational research purposes.

D4. Was the data collection protocol approved (or determined exempt) by an ethics review board?
We received ethics approval to analyse the anonymised data. Section 8 notes that ethics board restrictions prevent releasing the proprietary dataset portions.

E. Did you use AI assistants (e.g., ChatGPT, Copilot) in your research, coding, or writing?

E1. If you used AI assistants, did you include information about their use?
We used Claude (Anthropic) to assist with literature discovery, particularly for identifying relevant work in educational psychology and metacognitive research. All identified literature was independently verified, evaluated, and integrated by the authors. The AI assistant was used as a research tool similar to a search engine, not for writing or analysis. This use aligns with ACL ethics policy as the intellectual contribution, critical analysis, and all writing remain entirely the work of the human authors