

Large Language Models Approach Expert Pedagogical Quality in Math Tutoring but Differ in Instructional and Linguistic Profiles

Ramatu Oiza Abdulsalam¹, Segun Aroyehun²,

¹African University of science and Technology

Federal Capital Territory, Nigeria

rabdulsalam@student.aust.edu.ng

²University of Konstanz

Konstanz, Germany

segun.aroyehun@uni-konstanz.de

Abstract

Recent work has explored the use of large language models for generating tutoring responses in mathematics, yet it remains unclear how closely their instructional behavior aligns with expert human practice. We examine this question using a controlled, turn-level comparison in which expert human tutors, novice human tutors, and multiple large language models respond to the same set of math remediation conversation turns. We examine both instructional strategies and linguistic characteristics of tutoring responses, including restating and revoicing, pressing for accuracy, lexical diversity, readability, politeness, and agency. We find that large language models approach expert levels of perceived pedagogical quality on average but exhibit systematic differences in their instructional and linguistic profiles. In particular, large language models tend to under-use restating and revoicing strategies characteristic of expert human tutors, while producing longer, more lexically diverse, and more polite responses. Statistical analyses show that restating and revoicing, lexical diversity, and pressing for accuracy are positively associated with perceived pedagogical quality, whereas higher levels of agentic and polite language are negatively associated. Overall, recent large language models exhibit levels of perceived pedagogical quality comparable to expert human tutors, while relying on different instructional and linguistic strategies. These findings underscore the value of analyzing instructional strategies and linguistic characteristics when evaluating tutoring responses across human tutors and intelligent tutoring systems.

1 Introduction

Effective feedback plays a central role in supporting student learning by acknowledging effort, identifying errors, and providing clear guidance for self-correction (Lepper and Woolverton, 2002). In instructional settings, the quality of feedback depends not only on whether mistakes are addressed,

but also on how explanations are framed linguistically and pedagogically. As large language models (LLMs) are increasingly used to generate tutoring responses, an important open question is how closely their instructional behavior aligns with that of human tutors when responding to student errors.

Prior work (Zanotto and Aroyehun, 2025; Shaib et al., 2024; Namuduri et al., 2025) has shown that LLM-generated text exhibits systematic linguistic regularities relative to human writing across domains, including characteristic patterns of lexical choice and reduced stylistic variability. While this work provides valuable descriptive insights into how model-generated language differs from human language, it has largely examined language in settings without reference to task-specific evaluation criteria. As a result, it remains unclear whether such linguistic regularities shape instructional behavior or pedagogical evaluation in tutoring contexts.

This paper addresses this gap by comparing expert human tutors, novice human tutors, and multiple large language models responding to the same set of mathematics remediation conversation turns. Specifically, we examine differences in both instructional strategies and linguistic characteristics, including restating and revoicing, pressing for accuracy, lexical diversity, readability, politeness, and agency. We evaluate tutor responses in terms of pedagogical quality, operationalized through structured annotations of error handling and guidance, and examine how pedagogical quality relates to both instructional strategies and linguistic characteristics. This research is guided by three research questions. **RQ1:** How do instructional strategies and linguistic characteristics differ across expert human tutors, novice human tutors, and large language models in responses to the same mathematics remediation prompts? **RQ2:** How does perceived pedagogical quality vary across expert human tutors, novice human tutors, and large language mod-

els? **RQ3:** Which instructional strategies and linguistic characteristics are associated with perceived pedagogical quality in tutoring responses?

2 Related Work

Recent research has examined the use of large language models (LLMs) as mathematical tutors, with mixed evidence regarding their pedagogical quality. While LLMs can generate fluent and well-structured feedback, human tutors continue to outperform them on core pedagogical functions, particularly the accurate identification and correction of student errors involving conceptual misunderstandings or multi-step reasoning (Wang et al., 2024). Related findings show that LLMs may produce feedback that appears appropriate while failing to correctly determine whether a student response is incorrect (Kakarla et al., 2024).

Comparative work further indicates differences in how human and LLM tutors structure feedback. Both tend to rely on hint-based guidance rather than direct solutions, but LLMs more often provide compound feedback, whereas human tutors typically deliver focused, single-action interventions (Kucheria et al., 2025). These studies document differences in feedback structure but do not examine whether such differences correspond to systematic linguistic properties or how they relate to pedagogical quality.

Recent research comparing human and LLM-generated text report stable linguistic differences in evaluative and explanatory writing, including differences in lexical choice, syntactic patterns, and discourse organisation (Zanotto and Aroyehun, 2025; Shaib et al., 2024; Namuduri et al., 2025). This literature does not examine instructional feedback and does not evaluate pedagogical quality. Consequently, it remains unknown whether similar linguistic regularities appear in pedagogical feedback or how such regularities might align with a tutor's ability to identify and correct student errors.

Evaluations of tutoring interactions often focus on traits such as engagement, empathy, scaffolding, and conciseness (Chowdhury et al., 2025). While relevant to the tutoring experience, these traits are typically assessed independently of correctness and error identification and therefore capture only a subset of pedagogical quality.

The foundations of pedagogically effective feedback are grounded in human tutoring practices, particularly those of expert tutors who adapt their re-

sponses to the specific nature of a student's mistake (VanLehn, 2011). Prior work suggests that LLMs can produce feedback that is more extensive and readable than that of human tutors (Rashid et al., 2024), and pedagogical research consistently emphasises the role of feedback in supporting learning (Hattie and Timperley, 2007). At the same time, the tendency of LLMs to generate fluent but incorrect responses raises concerns in educational settings, where learners may rely on linguistic fluency as a cue for correctness.

Recent evaluations of LLMs on mathematical reasoning tasks address these concerns by assessing models' ability to detect, classify, and correct student errors (Li et al., 2024). Although LLMs can perform some of these tasks in isolation, attempts to prompt them to emulate expert tutors reveal limitations in adapting feedback to student misconceptions compared to human experts (Liu et al., 2023). Educational research has long established that accurately identifying what is correct or incorrect in student work is a necessary condition for pedagogical feedback that supports learning (Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Bamberger et al., 2010).

3 Methodology

3.1 Data

The dataset contains 300 teacher-student dialogues at middle school level (Macina et al., 2023) and at elementary level (Wang et al., 2024). The dataset includes 2476 individual conversations where a student presents a mathematical mistake and receives responses from multiple tutors. Each response includes annotations that identify pedagogically relevant features such as mistake identification, mistake location, providing guidance and actionability of the tutor's response (Maurya et al., 2024). Each conversation features eight to nine responses generated from two human tutors (an Expert and a Novice) and the remainder generated by various large language models, including GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023), Gemini (Team et al., 2024), Sonnet(Anthropic), Mistral 7B (Jiang et al., 2023), Llama-3.1-405B and two light weight models Llama-3.1-8B (Grattafiori et al., 2024) and Phi-3 (Abdin et al., 2024). The structure of the dataset makes it well-suited for studying how human and LLM tutors differ in both linguistic expression (e.g., lexical complexity and politeness) and pedagogical effectiveness, thus enabling systematic compar-

son.

Dataset Annotations The dataset consists of human annotation of responses using a set of pedagogical dimensions described in prior work (Maurya et al., 2024). The annotated dimensions are as follows:

- **Mistake Identification:** The tutor’s response should identify the student’s mistake or confusion.
- **Mistake Location:** Tutor’s response should clearly specify where the student’s mistake is located in their response.
- **Providing Guidance:** The tutor’s response should contain explanatory guidance.
- **Actionability:** The tutor’s response should inform the student on what they should do next.

Annotations were assigned using a three-tier graded scale, Yes: For when the tutor’s response demonstrated the pedagogical quality, To some extent: For some demonstration and No: For its absence. For our analysis, we mapped these labels to numerical values: Yes to 2, To some extent to 1, and No to 0. We then derive a pedagogical quality score by taking the average score across the four evaluation dimensions.

3.2 Linguistic and instructional features extraction

We extract a set of instructional and linguistic features designed to capture complementary aspects of tutor responses to student mistakes. Together, these features characterize how explanations are constructed, both in terms of instructional moves and surface linguistic form.

Instructional Features Two instructional features capture tutors’ use of pedagogically salient discourse moves commonly observed in instructional contexts (Suresh et al., 2022). Pressing for accuracy indicates whether a response explicitly challenges or prompts the student to reconsider the correctness of their answer, for example by questioning assumptions or highlighting inconsistencies. Restating or revoicing captures whether the tutor reformulates the student’s reasoning or answer in their own words, a strategy often used to clarify understanding and foreground misconceptions. These

features are operationalized as probabilistic scores reflecting the likelihood of the respective instructional moves in each response using a pre-trained transformers model¹. We use the probabilistic outputs of classifiers as continuous features to represent the degree to which each response exhibits a given instructional or linguistic feature, rather than converting classifier outputs to discrete labels. This allows us to capture graded variation in both binary and multiclass settings and avoids information loss from thresholding. This approach is consistent with recent work that leverages classifier probabilities as continuous indicators in downstream statistical analyses (Lasser et al., 2025).

Linguistic Features Response length is measured as the total number of tokens in each response and log-transformed to reduce skew and limit the influence of outliers. Lexical diversity is quantified using the Measure of Textual Lexical Diversity (MTLD), which captures the range of vocabulary use independently of text length. MTLD provides an index of lexical variation that is well suited to short-to-medium instructional texts(McCarthy and Jarvis, 2010).

Readability is assessed using the Flesch–Kincaid Reading Ease score (Kincaid et al., 1975), a widely used measure of textual accessibility based on the average number of words per sentence and average number of syllables per word. In the context of instructional feedback, readability serves as an indicator of surface-level processing demands imposed on the learner.

Readability and lexical diversity are used as proxies for instructional complexity at the linguistic level, capturing potential variation in cognitive processing demands from tutor responses.

Politeness is estimated using a transformer-based classifier (Srinivasan and Choi, 2022) trained to detect pragmatic markers of interpersonal tone, such as mitigation, respectfulness, and indirectness. This feature captures aspects of how corrective feedback is framed socially. We use the probabilistic output of the classifier corresponding to the politeness category as a feature.

Agency is operationalized using a transformer-based model that estimates the degree of agentic expression in text (Nikadon et al., 2025), including linguistic cues related to intention, control, and action orientation. In tutoring responses, agency

¹https://huggingface.co/StanfordSCALE/tutor_talkmoves_roberta_large_classifier

reflects how explanations position the learner and the tutor with respect to problem-solving and corrective action. We use the probabilistic output of the classifier as a feature.

All features are computed at the level of individual tutor responses.

3.3 Analytic strategy

Our analytic strategy was designed to address the three main research questions concerning (i) linguistic differences between human and LLM tutors, (ii) differences in pedagogical quality across sources, and (iii) the relationship between linguistic traits and pedagogical quality.

First, to examine linguistic and instructional differences between human and LLM tutors (RQ1), we compared tutor responses across seven features: pressing for accuracy, restating/revoicing, response length (log transformed), lexical diversity (MTLD), readability (Flesch–Kincaid Reading Ease), politeness, and agency. For each feature, we estimated group-level mean differences relative to expert human tutors, which serve as a baseline. We provide example tutor responses where the features are salient in Appendix A.

Second, to assess pedagogical quality across tutor types (RQ2), we relied on the four-dimensional annotation framework capturing mistake identification, mistake location, actionability, and provision of guidance. We aggregated scores assigned to each pedagogical dimension to derive a composite pedagogical quality score.

Third, to examine how linguistic traits are associated with pedagogical quality (RQ3), we construct a turn-centered measure of pedagogical quality. For each conversation turn, we compute the average pedagogical quality score across all tutors who responded to that turn and express each tutor’s score as a deviation from this turn-level mean. This transformation yields a measure of relative pedagogical quality that captures how a tutor’s response compares to alternative responses to the same instructional prompt.

We then summarize relative pedagogical quality at the tutor level by computing the mean deviation across all turns answered by a given tutor. Uncertainty estimates are obtained by computing standard errors across conversation turns. By anchoring comparisons within turns, this approach controls for variation in turn difficulty and isolates differences attributable to tutors’ responses rather than to the instructional context itself. While the

turn-centered measure provides a descriptive comparison of tutors’ relative pedagogical quality, it does not address how specific linguistic characteristics are associated with variation in pedagogical quality within turns.

To examine these associations, we estimated a linear fixed effects model at the conversation level. By demeaning both the outcome and predictors within each conversation, this specification isolates within-conversation variation, thereby controlling for all unobserved characteristics of the instructional context, such as task difficulty or error type. All predictors were standardized for comparability, and standard errors were clustered at the conversation level to account for dependence among responses within the same interaction. This combined approach allows us to assess raw patterns in the data while also estimating adjusted relationships between linguistic features and pedagogical quality.

4 Results

4.1 RQ1: Linguistic Differences Between Human and LLM Tutors

Figure 1 compares human and LLM tutors along seven instructional and linguistic dimensions, expressed as mean differences relative to expert human tutors, with error bars indicating uncertainty around the estimates. By construction, positive values indicate higher scores than expert tutors, whereas negative values indicate lower scores.

Across most dimensions, LLM tutors exhibit systematic and internally consistent differences relative to expert human tutors. For instructional moves, LLMs generally show higher levels of pressing for accuracy than expert tutors, although the magnitude varies across models. In contrast, restating or revoicing is consistently less prevalent in LLM-generated responses, with all models exhibiting negative deviations relative to experts. Novice human tutors also show lower levels of restating/revoicing, suggesting that this instructional move may be characteristic of expert tutoring rather than a general feature of human responses.

LLM responses are substantially longer than those produced by expert tutors, as reflected in positive deviations on log-transformed response length. This pattern is consistent across models, whereas novice human tutors produce markedly shorter responses than experts. A similar ordering is observed for lexical diversity, where LLMs ex-




Figure 1: Instructional and linguistic profiles of tutors relative to expert tutor baseline. Each panel shows the mean difference between a tutor and the expert tutor for a given feature, with error bars indicating 95% confidence intervals. Positive values indicate higher feature values than the expert tutor, while negative values indicate lower values. The horizontal dashed line denotes parity with the expert tutor.

hibit higher MTLD scores than expert tutors, while novice tutors show substantially lower lexical diversity.

Differences in readability are pronounced. All LLM tutors score substantially lower on the Flesch–Kincaid Reading Ease metric relative to expert tutors, indicating that their responses are, on average, less readable. The magnitude of this difference varies across models but is consistently negative. Novice tutors, by contrast, are closer to experts on readability, with estimates centered near zero.

LLM tutors also exhibit higher politeness scores than expert tutors across models, whereas novice tutors show only modest deviations. This suggests

that elevated politeness is a stable feature of LLM-generated feedback rather than a general property of non-expert tutoring.

Finally, patterns for agency differ from other linguistic features. Some LLMs exhibit lower agentic expression than expert tutors, while others are closer to parity. Novice tutors show higher agency scores than experts, indicating that agentic language does not align with tutoring expertise.

Taken together, these results indicate that LLM tutors differ from human tutors along multiple linguistic and instructional dimensions, with particularly strong and consistent differences in response length, lexical diversity, readability, and politeness

4.2 RQ2: Pedagogical Quality Across Tutor Types

Figure 2 reports tutors' average relative pedagogical quality scores, computed as deviations from the turn-level mean across all responses to the same student turn. By construction, positive values indicate responses that score higher than other responses to the same instructional prompt, whereas negative values indicate lower relative pedagogical quality.

Clear differences emerge across tutor types. Expert human tutors exhibit consistently positive relative pedagogical quality, indicating that their responses tend to score higher than other responses to the same student mistakes. In contrast, novice human tutors display strongly negative deviations, suggesting substantially lower pedagogical quality when evaluated relative to alternative responses within the same conversational context.

LLM tutors span a wide range of relative pedagogical quality. Some models cluster near or above zero, indicating performance comparable to or exceeding the turn-level average, whereas others fall below zero. Notably, higher-performing LLMs approach the relative pedagogical quality of expert tutors on average, while lower-performing models exhibit negative deviations similar to novice tutors.

Importantly, these differences are observed within identical instructional contexts and therefore reflect variation in tutor responses rather than differences in student turns or task difficulty.

4.3 RQ3: Associations Between Linguistic and Instructional Features and Pedagogical Quality

Figure 3 report standardized coefficients from a within-conversation regression predicting relative pedagogical quality from our set of instructional and linguistic features. Additional details on the regression model results are reported in Table 1 in the Appendix.

Two instructional variables are positively associated with pedagogical quality. Restating/revoicing shows a large positive association ($\beta = 0.78$, 95% CI [0.65, 0.90], $p < 0.001$), and pressing for accuracy also shows a positive association ($\beta = 0.17$, 95% CI [0.05, 0.30], $p = 0.007$).

Among linguistic variables, lexical diversity (MTLD) is positively associated with pedagogical quality ($\beta = 0.62$, 95% CI [0.49, 0.75], $p < 0.001$). In contrast, readability is not statistically associated with pedagogical quality ($\beta = 0.08$,

95% CI [-0.03, 0.18], $p = 0.151$), and response length is not statistically associated with pedagogical quality ($\beta = 0.19$, 95% CI [-0.01, 0.39], $p = 0.059$).

Two linguistic variables are negatively associated with pedagogical quality. Politeness shows a negative association ($\beta = -0.19$, 95% CI [-0.30, -0.08], $p < 0.001$), as does agency ($\beta = -0.68$, 95% CI [-0.77, -0.58], $p < 0.001$).

In sum, pedagogical quality is positively associated with restating/revoicing, pressing for accuracy, and lexical diversity, while politeness and agency show negative association. Readability and response length show no statistically detectable association in this specification.

Conclusion

This study proposes a framework for evaluating pedagogical quality in human and LLM-based tutoring by jointly examining instructional moves and linguistic features while holding conversational context constant. Rather than treating surface fluency or tutor source as indicators of effective tutoring, our findings show that pedagogical quality is most strongly associated with specific instructional behaviors, in particular restating or revoicing student reasoning and pressing for accuracy alongside a limited set of linguistic characteristics.

Among linguistic features, higher lexical diversity is positively associated with pedagogical quality, whereas elevated politeness and agentic language are negatively associated. Readability and response length, by contrast, show no statistically detectable association. These results suggest that pedagogically effective feedback is not characterized by optimizing linguistic complexity or assertiveness, but by how linguistic choices are aligned with instructional function.

Crucially, both human and LLM tutors exhibit substantial variation along these dimensions. Higher pedagogical quality is observed in responses that combine targeted instructional moves with linguistic configurations that support error diagnosis and clarification, regardless of whether the response is produced by a human or an LLM. This suggests that pedagogical quality is better understood as a property of response-level features rather than of tutor type.

For the development of LLM-based tutors, these findings imply that optimization efforts should focus on identifying and reproducing feature combi-




Figure 2: Relative pedagogical quality across tutors. Each datapoint shows average relative pedagogical quality for each tutor (with 95% CI) when responding to the same conversation turns. The dashed line indicates parity with the turn-level average; values above (below) zero indicate higher (lower) perceived pedagogical quality relative to other tutors.




Figure 3: Instructional and linguistic correlates of pedagogical quality. Coefficients from an ordinary least squares model predicting perceived pedagogical quality at the tutor response level. Horizontal lines indicate 95% confidence intervals. The specification includes a control for response length. Positive coefficients indicate that higher values of a feature are associated with higher perceived pedagogical quality, while negative coefficients indicate associations with lower perceived pedagogical quality. Standard errors are clustered by conversation turn to account for multiple tutor responses to the same turn.

nations associated with higher pedagogical quality, rather than on mimicking human tutors per se or increasing linguistic expressiveness in isolation.

Limitations

Given the scope of this study, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, although the dataset comprises approximately 300 conversations

and 2,480 tutor responses, which is sufficient for the within-turn comparative analyses conducted here, a larger dataset would allow for more precise estimation of smaller effects and for finer-grained analyses across tutor groups.

Second, the set of instructional and linguistic features examined in this study is necessarily selective rather than exhaustive. While the features were chosen to capture key instructional moves and relevant dimensions of linguistic expression, other aspects of tutor responses such as discourse structure, epistemic framing, or mathematical specificity may also be relevant to pedagogical quality and warrant systematic investigation in future work.

Third, the analysis is limited to English language interactions in a mathematical tutoring context. Although some of the instructional patterns identified here may generalize to other domains or languages, extending this framework to additional subject areas and linguistic contexts is an important direction for future research.

Finally, pedagogical quality in this study is assessed through structured annotations applied to single-turn tutor responses. While this approach allows for controlled comparison across identical instructional prompts, it does not capture downstream student learning outcomes. Future work could extend this framework to multi-turn interactions and incorporate student responses or learning signals as complementary indicators of pedagogical effectiveness.

References

Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Hany Awadalla, Ahmed Awadallah, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Jianmin Bao, Harkirat Behl, and 1 others. 2024. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219*.

Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, and 1 others. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.

Honi Joyce Bamberger, Christine Oberdorf, and Karren Schultz-Ferrell. 2010. *Math misconceptions: PreK-grade 5: From misunderstanding to deep understanding*. Heinemann.

Sankalan Pal Chowdhury, Terry Jingchen Zhang, Donya Rooein, Dirk Hovy, Tanja Käser, and Mrinmaya Sachan. 2025. Educators' perceptions of large language models as tutors: Comparing human and ai tutors in a blind text-only setting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08702*.

Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, and 1 others. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.

John Hattie and Helen Timperley. 2007. The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1):81–112.

AQ Jiang, A Sablayrolles, A Mensch, and 1 others. 2023. Mistral 7b. arxiv preprint. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 100.

Sanjit Kakarla, Danielle Thomas, Jionghao Lin, Shivaang Gupta, and Kenneth R Koedinger. 2024. Using large language models to assess tutors' performance in reacting to students making math errors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03238*.

J Peter Kincaid, Robert P Fishburne Jr, Richard L Rogers, and Brad S Chissom. 1975. Derivation of new readability formulas (automated readability index, fog count and flesch reading ease formula) for navy enlisted personnel. Technical report.

Aayush Kucheria, Nitin Sawhney, and Arto Hellas. 2025. Comparing behavioral patterns of llm and human tutors: A population-level analysis with the cima dataset. In *Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jana Lasser, Alina Herderich, Joshua Garland, Segun Taofeek Aroyehun, David Garcia, and Mirta Galesic. 2025. Collective moderation of hate, toxicity, and extremity in online discussions. *PNAS nexus*, 4(11):pgaf369.

Mark R Lepper and Maria Woolverton. 2002. The wisdom of practice: Lessons learned from the study of highly effective tutors. In *Improving academic achievement*, pages 135–158. Elsevier.

Xiaoyuan Li, Wenjie Wang, Moxin Li, Junrong Guo, Yang Zhang, and Fuli Feng. 2024. Evaluating mathematical reasoning of large language models: A focus on error identification and correction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00755*.

Naiming Liu, Shashank Sonkar, Zichao Wang, Simon Woodhead, and Richard G Baraniuk. 2023. Novice learner and expert tutor: Evaluating math reasoning abilities of large language models with misconceptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02439*.

Jakub Macina, Nico Daheim, Sankalan Chowdhury, Tanmay Sinha, Manu Kapur, Iryna Gurevych, and Mrinmaya Sachan. 2023. Mathdial: A dialogue tutoring dataset with rich pedagogical properties grounded in math reasoning problems. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5602–5621.

Kaushal Kumar Maurya, KV Srivatsa, Kseniia Petukhova, and Ekaterina Kochmar. 2024. Unifying ai tutor evaluation: An evaluation taxonomy for pedagogical ability assessment of llm-powered ai tutors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.09416*.

Philip M McCarthy and Scott Jarvis. 2010. Mtld, vod-d, and hd-d: A validation study of sophisticated approaches to lexical diversity assessment. *Behavior research methods*, 42(2):381–392.

Ramya Namuduri, Yating Wu, Anshun Asher Zheng, Manya Wadhwa, Greg Durrett, and Junyi Jessy Li. 2025. Qudsim: Quantifying discourse similarities in llm-generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.09373*.

David J Nicol and Debra Macfarlane-Dick. 2006. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in higher education*, 31(2):199–218.

Jan Nikadon, Caterina Suitner, Tomaso Erseghe, Lejla Džanko, and Magdalena Formanowicz. 2025. Berta-gent: The development of a novel tool to quantify agency in textual data. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.

Md Mamunur Rashid, Nilsu Atilgan, Jonathan Dobre, Stephanie Day, Veronika Penkova, Mert Küçük, Steven R Clapp, and Ben D Sawyer. 2024. Humanizing ai in education: A readability comparison of llm and human-created educational content. In *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, volume 68, pages 596–603. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.

Chantal Shaib, Yanai Elazar, Junyi Jessy Li, and Byron C Wallace. 2024. *Detection and measurement of syntactic templates in generated text*. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6416–6431, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Anirudh Srinivasan and Eunsol Choi. 2022. *TyDiP: A dataset for politeness classification in nine typologically diverse languages*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 5723–5738, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Abhijit Suresh, Jennifer Jacobs, Charis Harty, Margaret Perkoff, James H. Martin, and Tamara Sumner. 2022. The TalkMoves dataset: K-12 mathematics lesson transcripts annotated for teacher and student discursive moves. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 4654–4662, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.

Gemini Team, Petko Georgiev, Ving Ian Lei, Ryan Burnell, Libin Bai, Anmol Gulati, Garrett Tanzer, Damien Vincent, Zhufeng Pan, Shibo Wang, and 1 others. 2024. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*.

Kurt VanLehn. 2011. The relative effectiveness of human tutoring, intelligent tutoring systems, and other tutoring systems. *Educational psychologist*, 46(4):197–221.

Rose Wang, Qingyang Zhang, Carly Robinson, Susanna Loeb, and Dorottya Demszky. 2024. Bridging the novice-expert gap via models of decision-making: A case study on remediating math mistakes. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2174–2199.

Sergio E. Zanotto and Segun Aroyehun. 2025. *Linguistic and embedding-based profiling of texts generated by humans and large language models*. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 22852–22869, Suzhou, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Example text with extracted features

Examples of tutors with top linguistic Scores include:

- **Politeness- Human Tutor:** “*Can I ask what you thought about the third year for?*”
- **Agency- Human Tutor:** “*Great try! What was your first step?*”
- **MTLD- Human Tutor:** “*There seems to be mistake in here. could you please tell me how much money would it cost for a person to go through arcade tokens, mini golf and go-karting?*”
- **Reading Ease- Human Tutor:** “*Ah, not quite. 100 * 2 = 200*”
- **Grade Level- Human Tutor:** “*So, the two figures you have calculated are 16mph and 16 weeks, assuming a gain of an equal amount of speed in each week, how would you calculate the increase in speed in each week?*”
- **Pressing for Accuracy- Human Tutor:** “*Oh, no that’s not it. 10 x 5 = 50, but 10 / 5 is something else*”
- **Restating/Revoicing- Human Tutor:** “*25 + 16 = 41 marbles*”
- **Politeness- LLM:** “*Great job summarizing the main points of the lesson! Let’s review any questions or areas you’d like to clarify further.*”

- **Agency- LLM:** "Great job on your progress; let's tackle the next challenge together!"
- **MTLD- LLM:** "Actually, let's take another look at that calculation together - I think there might be a small mistake in the multiplication, could you try it again or show me the exact steps your calculator is taking?"
- **Reading Ease- LLM:** "That's a good try, but let's try again. If we subtract 156 from 163, we get 7. Can you see how we got that?"
- **Reading Ease- LLM:** "Actually, I think there might be a small mistake in the last step of your calculation - 100 cents is indeed equal to \$1, but you might want to consider that the question asks for the cost in dollars, and your calculation is correct, so the final answer is correct, but let's make sure you understand that 100 cents equals 1 dollar, so in this case, the answer is indeed \$1, but in general, if you had more than 100 cents, you would need to convert, for example, 200 cents would be \$2, does that make sense?"
- **Pressing for Accuracy- LLM:** "You're really close, but remember, there are 6 double windows downstairs, not 12. So the correct calculation should be $6 * 2 * 4$ for downstairs and $8 * 4$ for upstairs. Give it another try!"
- **Restating/Revoicing- LLM:** "Let's recheck that multiplication: 30 times 10 is 300."

B Regression model results

Table 1 shows the output of the regression model assessing the relationship between instructional moves and linguistic features and pedagogical quality.

Predictor	β	95% CI	p
Pressing for accuracy	0.174	[0.047, 0.301]	0.007
Restating / revoicing	0.775	[0.648, 0.902]	< 0.001
Lexical diversity (MTLD)	0.620	[0.494, 0.745]	< 0.001
Readability (Flesch)	0.078	[-0.028, 0.184]	0.151
Politeness	-0.189	[-0.295, -0.083]	< 0.001
Agency	-0.676	[-0.769, -0.582]	< 0.001
Response length (log)	0.191	[-0.007, 0.389]	0.059
Observations (N)		2444	
R^2		0.262	
Adjusted R^2		0.260	
F-statistic		126.1	
Prob (F-statistic)		< .001	

Table 1: Within-conversation regression predicting relative pedagogical quality from instructional and linguistic features. Coefficients are standardized. Standard errors are clustered by conversation.