

Bounded confidence modeling predicts how group work affects student math anxiety

Katherine Toms*

Maya Williams*

Matthew S. Mizuhara*,[†]

July 10, 2024

Abstract

Math anxiety is ubiquitous. It not only affects student performance and confidence, but also can lead to avoidance of further math/STEM classes and careers. Cooperative learning (i.e., group work) is a proven strategy that can reduce math anxiety and has additional social and pedagogical benefits. However, depending on the individuals involved, some peer interactions may mitigate anxiety while others exacerbate it. Mathematical modeling is one approach to help untangle this complex dynamic. In this work we introduce a bounded confidence model to evaluate how math anxiety levels are affected by student group work. Although the model is quite simple, it captures non-obvious phenomena including how varying group sizes and frequency of switching groups can affect anxiety levels. The model is easily adaptable to incorporate additional personal and societal factors making it ripe for future research.

1 Introduction

Instructors who have used cooperative learning strategies in class understand the practical challenges of how to best form students groups, how frequently to switch group members (if at all), and how to structure assignments so that groups are both productive and on task. However, despite similar implementations from class to class, sometimes cooperative groups seem to “work” while other times they fall flat. Of course, this is not tremendously surprising: social interactions are complex, and expecting students to collaborate on challenging or frustrating material relies on many personal and environmental factors aligning. One of the factors that can affect productive

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, The College of New Jersey

[†]Corresponding author: mizuharm@tcnj.edu

group work is anxiety caused by the subject matter itself. Perhaps the most ubiquitous in classrooms is math anxiety, the severity of which can affect the benefits of group work for a student.

In this work we introduce a mathematical model to study the dynamics of students' math anxieties in a classroom. While very simple, the model captures interesting dynamics and non-trivial effects resulting from group work, and allows us to investigate how peer-to-peer interactions can either mitigate or aggravate anxiety. The paper is structured as follows. We begin with a review of relevant literature in Section 2. We briefly highlight pertinent educational research on math anxiety and the use of cooperative learning. After reviewing the existing dynamical systems models of math anxiety, we introduce the bounded confidence model in Section 3, inspired by the Hegselmann-Krause model of opinion dynamics. Section 4 contains the numerical findings of our research: using Monte Carlo simulations we study how model parameters affect math anxiety levels and how various ways of forming (and shuffling) groups in the classroom affect anxiety. We conclude with some summarizing thoughts and future directions of research in Section 5.

2 Background

2.1 Math anxiety

Students combat anxieties linked to the learning and doing of specific subject matter. Perhaps the most commonly studied and reported example is math anxiety, which is defined as the “feeling of tension, apprehension, or fear that interferes with math performance” [5]. Math anxiety is commonly identified through self-reported questionnaires, e.g. the Mathematics Anxiety Rating Scale (MARS) [74] or its related successors [2, 41]. To give a sense of its prevalence, some studies report 93% of people in the United States experience some level of math anxiety [15], with an estimated 25% of 4-year college students and 80% of community college students experiencing moderate to high levels of math anxiety [19]. Below we very briefly highlight a few contributing factors, consequences, and prevention methods for math anxiety. However, for a more thorough introduction we refer the reader to [27, 7, 65, 38, 72, 81].

Math-anxious individuals tend to have negative attitudes about both math itself and their own abilities to learn and do it [5]. Unsurprisingly, math anxiety leads to lower performance on assessments, higher levels of academic procrastination, and avoidance of math/STEM courses and careers [65, 72, 11]. It is important, however, to emphasize that math anxiety is independent from both intellect and ability [6, 24]. While it is correlated with other forms of anxiety, such as test anxiety or general anxiety, it is distinct [27, 49, 67].

Math anxiety has many contributing factors, which are complex and nuanced. Broadly speaking, it stems from a combination of negative experiences in and out of the classroom, along with some genetic risk factors (e.g., it is associated to cognition and general anxiety) [27]. Studies show

that math anxiety is more common in girls [90], perhaps due to stereotype threat [76]. Similarly, a female teacher's anxiety can disproportionately affect girls' anxieties in the classroom [13]. When considered along with the avoidance behaviors described above, math anxiety is a contributing factor to under-representation of women in STEM fields [4, 43].

Social and environmental factors such as home and classroom experiences play a large role in both the development and reduction of math anxiety. Parents' and teachers' own attitudes or negative comments about math can shape student views [17, 29, 85]. Teaching styles and classroom practices have a strong impact on students' anxieties. For example, overemphasis on correctness, memorization, and speed, rather than on process, understanding, and autonomous discovery results in higher levels of anxiety [30]. Accordingly, best teaching practices to reduce math anxiety include active learning opportunities where students can explore, make mistakes, and discuss concepts. Common strategies include use of technology, games, or cooperative learning with peers [15].

2.2 Cooperative learning

Cooperative learning consists of partitioning students into small groups so that they can work together on a shared task or tasks. There is ample evidence showing that such group work can help students better achieve learning goals and improve both communication and critical thinking skills [46, 47, 91, 78].

Whether it is best to implement mixed-ability grouping (wherein low-achieving students are grouped with high-achieving students) or homogeneous grouping (by achievement level) is contested within educational literature [32]. For example, some studies show that mixed-ability grouping can result in higher learning outcomes of low-achieving students when compared to homogeneous grouping [60, 40, 89, 18]. Others describe settings where homogeneous groupings had better outcomes [44, 8].

From elementary school onward, student experiences in cooperative groups can also depend on a myriad of variables such as group members' genders, personalities, friendships, cultures, and personal motivations [52, 61, 50, 35, 53]. This brings us to the main question of our study: how do cooperative groups affect students' math anxieties? Several works have shown that cooperative learning can improve student anxiety, particularly for female students [55, 9, 12, 25]. On the other hand, it is possible that some students' anxieties are not affected or even increase when asked to work with peers [86, 71, 87, 28]. Factors that can lead to an increase in a student's anxiety include fear of negative evaluation by group members and comparison with peers who seem more competent. On the other hand, comfort or familiarity with group members, hearing diverse ways of thinking, and interacting with peers who similarly struggled with material are all factors that decrease anxiety levels [21].

2.3 Previous models of math anxiety

Understandably, the vast majority of mathematical/computational techniques to study math anxiety are data-driven and utilize statistical techniques to correlate student anxieties to other variables. Modern approaches employ a range of techniques, such as penalized regression (e.g., LASSO) and random forests [45], decision trees [79], cognitive network analysis [34, 81], and structural equation modeling [1, 54, 77, 66].

On the other hand, dynamical systems approaches to study student anxiety are much more sparse. Differential equations models have been developed to study the relationship between exercise and anxiety [73], or how an individual’s effort, knowledge, and anxiety interact [80]. Predominantly, however, epidemiological/compartment-type models are used to describe the transfer of students through various populations (e.g., susceptible to anxiety, math anxious, or recovered from anxiety) [36, 84, 3, 83]. We note, however, that such compartment models assume a homogeneous mixing assumption which not only prevents individual-scale resolution, but also assumes individuals have equal probabilities of interacting [10]. Moreover, they lack the nuance of describing math anxiety as a continuous spectrum. To our knowledge, there is no existing literature for a dynamical model of an individual’s anxiety and how it is affected by social interactions. Given both our interest in cooperative learning and how individualistic math anxiety is, new modeling approaches are needed.

3 Bounded confidence model

Bounded confidence models (BCMs) originated as a way to study the evolution of opinions resulting from interactions between individuals. The crucial idea underlying BCMs is that an individual’s opinion is described by a continuous-valued variable which can only be affected by others with sufficiently similar opinions. For nice surveys of the literature we refer to [62, 14].

Let $x_i^t \in [0, 1]$ be the continuous-valued opinion of individual i , $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, at time t . One commonly used model, the Deffuant-Weisbush model [26], evolves opinions by randomly interacting two individuals from the group of N individuals at each timestep:

$$x_i^{t+1} = \begin{cases} x_i^t + \gamma(x_j^t - x_i^t) & \text{if } |x_j^t - x_i^t| < \varepsilon \\ x_i^t & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

The confidence bound ε determines the tolerance or openness of individuals to differing opinions, while the cautiousness parameter γ determines how drastically individuals update their opinions [70].

The Hegselmann-Krause model [37], on the other hand, is better suited for group interactions. It updates opinions based an individual’s entire influencing network simultaneously: defining

$$I(t, x_i^t) = \{j : |x_j^t - x_i^t| < \varepsilon\},$$

then

$$x_i^{t+1} = \frac{1}{|I(t, x_i^t)|} \sum_{j \in I(t, x_i^t)} x_j^t. \quad (3.2)$$

Generally speaking, varying the confidence bound ε in either model affects whether or not consensus or fragmentation forms in the long term. Consensus occurs when all opinions converge to the same value, whereas fragmentation is defined by the formation of multiple opinion clusters.

Many extensions of both models have been studied. Various researchers have explored BCMs on time-independent graphs [31, 70, 75, 16], time-dependent or adaptive graphs [82, 48, 57], or even hypergraphs [39]. Many have considered the effects of heterogeneous parameters [51, 20, 42, 64, 88, 58]. Several studies have investigated the effect of repulsion in BCMs [23, 33, 22]. Finally, some studies include higher-dimensional opinion spaces [63, 16, 59]. For more details on many of these and other extensions we recommend [56].

3.1 Math anxiety model

We now describe our BCM for the dynamics of math anxiety in a classroom. Fix a number of students N . The i th student has a level of math anxiety denoted by $x_i^t \in [0, 1]$. Here, $x_i^t = 1$ indicates a high level of math anxiety at time t and $x_i^t = 0$ a complete lack of math anxiety (e.g., as determined from a MARS-like questionnaire [74]). Let $(A_{ij}^t)_{i,j=1}^N$ be a symmetric adjacency matrix encoding students groups at time t . That is, $A_{ij} = A_{ji} = 1$ if students i and j are assigned to the same cooperative group; otherwise $A_{ij} = A_{ji} = 0$.

Given the literature on cooperative learning's effects on anxiety described above (particularly the qualitative data from [21]), we consider two simple contributing factors:

1. (Positive interactions) A student's anxiety level decreases when they interact with another student who experiences similar levels of anxiety.
2. (Negative interactions) A student's anxiety level increases due to fear of negative evaluation. If they work with another student who has a much higher ability (which, for simplicity, we associate with low anxiety), then it exacerbates their anxiety.

The evolution of a student's anxiety is then given by

$$x_i^{t+1} = \frac{1}{1 + |S_i^t|} \left(x_i^t + \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ij}^t f(x_i^t, x_j^t) \right). \quad (3.3)$$

Here

$$S_i^t := \{j : A_{ij}^t f(x_i^t, x_j^t) \neq 0\},$$

is the set of influencing peers for student i , and the function f describes the two mechanisms described above:

$$f(x, y) = \begin{cases} \gamma x & \text{if } |x - y| < \varepsilon \\ (1 - \gamma) + \gamma x & \text{if } x \geq y + \varepsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

The parameter ε represents the threshold between positive and negative peer-to-peer interactions. For simplicity it is assumed that there is no gap between positive and negative interactions. If a student interacts with a peer who has a sufficiently similar level of anxiety, then the student’s anxiety decreases by the receptiveness factor $0 < \gamma < 1$ (cf. (3.1)). On the other hand, if a student interacts with a peer whose anxiety is significantly lower, then their anxiety increases towards 1 by the same rate γ . As $\gamma \rightarrow 1$, students become less receptive/sensitive to these peer interactions. Each discrete timestep t represents a single interaction of the group. Practically speaking, however, the exact interpretation of the timescale is less crucial here since we will primarily be focused with asymptotic behavior.

This model is inspired primarily by [16] where the effects of various graphs in a Hegselmann-Krause BCM are studied, and [23, 33, 22] where BCMs with repulsion are studied. In contrast to previous BCMs, values in (3.3) do not converge toward the mean (cf. (3.2)). Instead, our interest is on the simple competition between the two mechanisms (positive/negative interactions) driving anxieties in opposite directions.

The main aim of our work is to explore the effects of varying parameters in (3.3). In particular, we are interested in how various group structures A_{ij}^t affect the dynamics of anxiety.

4 Numerical results

Unless groups change over time, dynamics in (3.3) typically approach an equilibrium. Computationally we check for equilibria using an ℓ^1 norm:

$$\Delta^t := \sum_{i=1}^N |x_i^{t+1} - x_i^t|. \quad (4.4)$$

In all subsequent simulations, we consider two stopping criteria: either $\Delta^t < 10^{-4}$ or $t = 10^4$. In the case that groups change over time, simulations necessarily evolve to $t = 10^4$. Denote the final simulation time by T_{final} .

To ensure results are representative, we use Monte Carlo simulations: each virtual “classroom” of N students are initialized with anxieties randomly and uniformly on $[0, 1]$ and time evolves until a stopping criterion above occurs. Experiments are repeated $M = 1000$ times and the following two metrics are computed for the entire data set (with abuse of notation in the subscript i for notational ease):

- the average final anxiety of all $N \times M$ students:

$$\langle x^{T_{final}} \rangle := \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^{NM} x_i^{T_{final}}, \quad (4.5)$$

- the percentage of students whose anxieties improved:

$$P(x^{T_{final}}) := \frac{|\{i: x_i^{T_{final}} < x_i^0\}|}{NM}. \quad (4.6)$$

4.1 Non-monotone dependence on γ

To begin building intuition, and to understand the effects of varying parameters, first assume the simplest case with all-to-all coupling, i.e., $A_{ij}^t \equiv 1$ (of course, if $A_{ij}^t \equiv 0$ then the model has no dynamics at all). Some representative time series are shown in Figure 1 for a “classroom” of size $N = 30$. Like other BCMs, as ε is increased, dynamics transition from fragmentation to consensus. In this model, it is clear that if consensus forms, it necessarily converges to 0.




Figure 1: Dynamics of anxiety with $\gamma = 0.95$, and no group structure ($A_{ij}^t \equiv 1$) with **a)** $\varepsilon = 0.1$, and **b)** $\varepsilon = 0.2$ **c)** $\varepsilon = 0.5$. Like other BCMs, when the confidence bound ε is small then there is fragmentation of asymptotic anxieties, and when it is sufficiently large there is consensus. Here, $N = 30$.

Figure 2 shows the quantitative effect that varying γ and ε have on the asymptotic anxieties (again for $N = 30$ students). As expected from Figure 1, the average anxiety $\langle x^{T_{final}} \rangle$ decreases and the proportion of students with improved anxiety $P(x^{T_{final}})$ increases as ε grows.

The region of particular interest is $\varepsilon \approx 0$ and $\gamma \approx 1$. For these parameters, student anxieties do not vary dramatically in a single timestep, and the threshold for positive interactions is low. Both are realistic from a modeling point of view. In this region dynamics are also particularly sensitive to parameter variation. Interestingly, both $\langle x^{T_{final}} \rangle$ and $P(x^{T_{final}})$ are non-monotonic as a function of γ ; which becomes more dramatic for small values of ε . In other words, there is an optimal receptiveness γ to minimize anxiety levels. This aligns with intuition that being either too receptive or not receptive enough to one’s peers is detrimental for anxiety.

Qualitatively, results are similar when varying classroom sizes, though the non-monotone effect is more pronounced for smaller classroom sizes (see Appendix Figures S1-S2). As such, for all subsequent simulations we fix $N = 30$ students and take $\gamma = 0.95$ and $\varepsilon = 0.1$. Monte Carlo simulations suggest that, on average, both $\langle x^{T_{final}} \rangle$ and $P(x^{T_{final}})$ are close to 0.5 for these parameters (see Appendix Figure A3 for histograms of the data). As such, they serve as a convenient baseline of comparison to different intervention strategies.




Figure 2: As ε increases, generally student anxiety levels improve. Dependence on γ is generally less sensitive, though there is a sharp transition of dynamics as $\gamma \rightarrow 1$, reminiscent of a boundary layer. The particular region of interest is when $\gamma \approx 1$ and $\varepsilon \approx 0$, where we observe more dramatic sensitivity to parameter choices. Here, $N = 30$.

4.2 Fixed collaborative groups: small but not too small is ideal for randomly formed groups

We next incorporate collaborative groups and investigate how group sizes affect anxiety. Groups are created using two methods: forming groups randomly or forming groups homogeneously by anxiety levels (e.g., students are sorted and grouped by initial anxiety). Notice that this type of homogeneous grouping is distinct from the ability based grouping described in Section 2. When group sizes do not divide the class size evenly, remaining students are added to groups as needed. For example, for $N = 30$ students and groups of size 4, we form 2 groups of size 5 and 5 groups of size 4. Since this process becomes meaningless (both mathematically and experimentally) for large group sizes, we restrict to groups to between 2 and 6 students.

The results are summarized in Figure 3. Creating small, homogeneous groupings results in the largest overall reduction in anxiety. This is not surprising since homogeneous grouping maximizes the number of positive peer interactions (see also Appendix Figures A4, A7). On the other hand, for randomly formed groups, it is surprising to see a non-monotone dependence of anxiety on group size. Interestingly, randomly formed groups of size 2 are actually detrimental to anxiety levels ($P(x^{T_{final}}) \approx 19\%$), while groups of size 3 are the most beneficial. Data show that for groups of

size 3, $\langle x^{T_{final}} \rangle \approx 0.35$ and $P(x^{T_{final}}) \approx 0.55$, performing slightly better than the all-to-all baseline above.

In groups of size 2, interactions are either polarizing or ineffective: generally, students' anxieties converge to either 0 or 1, or they do not change at all (see Appendix Figures A4-A5). For groups of size 3, mediating effects appear due to the 3rd group member: while some students' anxieties still polarize to 0 or 1, a significant number of students' anxieties converge to 0.5. Indeed, a typical student in this latter group has one peer with similar anxiety and another peer with very low anxiety, resulting in one positive and one negative interaction in the group (see Appendix Figures A4, A6).




Figure 3: **a)** When students are formed into groups randomly, average anxiety is minimized when groups have 3 students. In fact, groups of size 2 have worse outcomes than the baseline case with no group work. **b)** When students are grouped homogeneously by anxiety levels then there is great reduction overall in anxiety, and groups of size 2 are optimal. Other parameters: $N = 30$, $\gamma = 0.95$, and $\varepsilon = 0.1$.

4.3 Periodically changing groups can dramatically improve anxieties

Finally, we consider the effect of changing randomly formed groups periodically over time, keeping the sizes and number of groups constant. Since groups will continually change, no equilibrium is possible, so simulations are run to $T_{final} = 10^4$. Figure 4 shows how frequency of reshuffling groups of size 3 affects anxiety levels. The data point at 0 represents groups of size 3 which are fixed for all time. The data are quite fascinating: changing groups very rapidly performs worse than keeping groups fixed. Figure 4b shows that switching groups too frequently does not allow sufficient time for the mediating effects described in the previous section to take place and ultimately exacerbates anxiety overall.

However, as the duration of groups increases there is an optimal time when average anxiety is minimized and almost all student anxieties improve. Switching groups every ≈ 68 timesteps results in $\langle x^{T_{final}} \rangle \approx 0.08$ and $P(x^{T_{final}}) \approx .92$ (see also Appendix Figure A8). Increasing group

duration beyond this point again has diminishing returns. Repeating simulations with groups of size 2 or 4 yields similar qualitative results (see Appendix Figures A9-A10), so the minimizing effect of shuffling groups appears quite robust. It is particularly surprising to us that periodically changing groups gives rise to such dramatic asymmetry in the dynamics. That is: by incorporating periodic and random shuffling of groups at the right frequency, one drives the system toward consensus at 0.




Figure 4: The effect of changing randomly formed groups of size 3 periodically. **a)** Data at 0 represents keeping groups fixed for all time and serves as a baseline. Interestingly, switching groups too frequently is worse for anxiety than simply fixing groups for all time. However, if groups are changed on a slower timescale, then anxieties are much lower overall. **b)** Representative simulation switching groups every $t = 20$ timesteps and **c)** every $t = 70$ timesteps. Other parameters: $N = 30$, $\gamma = 0.95$, and $\varepsilon = 0.1$.

5 Conclusion

Although distinct, there is understandably a strong correlation between students with math anxiety and other science anxieties [68, 69]. The BCM proposed above is certainly applicable to other anxieties that are similarly affected by personal interactions.

We also emphasize that the model in its current simple state is essentially qualitative and that it would be ill-advised to interpret or draw literal conclusions about best practices on group work from this study. For example, the model omits a key ingredient for teachers: learning outcomes. Certainly the strategies to form student groups in a real classroom must also consider these and other factors. Rather, the results suggest interesting qualitative ideas that merit further investigation in the future, though they certainly resonate with anecdotal experiences of the authors: groups of small (but not too small) sizes tend to improve anxiety compared to larger ones. Surprisingly, shuffling groups periodically has a non-monotone effect: there is some optimal frequency of group switching when anxieties are minimized.

As an introductory study, there are of course many limitations to the current model whose improvements would be interesting for future study, both from mathematical and educational points of view. For example, in practice one can obviously not teach for an unlimited time, so future

works should investigate how limited time affects outcomes. Heterogeneities of ε and γ can also be considered.

Finally, the flexibility of BCMs allows for adaptations to include other factors readily. A few immediate generalizations worth investigating are the effects of teachers (who influence all students regardless of group work, and perhaps experience math anxiety themselves) or parental influences. BCMs with multi-dimensional opinion spaces (see e.g., [16]) provide the freedom to incorporate other anxiety-interacting characteristics for each student such as self-efficacy, prior knowledge, gender, or race [65]. As an example, one can code a student's gender as a continuous variable $y_i \in [0, 1]$ (we acknowledge that this does not accurately reflect the true spectrum of genders, but perhaps could be interpreted as the degree a student feels in-group or out-group based on gender). Then, by choosing an appropriate interaction function $f: [0, 1]^2 \times [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, effects of gender can be included into the model. Work in any of the above directions would certainly be aided further by collecting and fitting of real-world data.

Acknowledgments. The authors acknowledge use of the ELSA high performance computing cluster at The College of New Jersey for conducting the research reported in this paper. This cluster is funded in part by the National Science Foundation under grant numbers OAC-1826915 and OAC-2320244.

References

- [1] Ahmet Akin and Izzet N Kurbanoglu. The relationships between math anxiety, math attitudes, and self-efficacy: A structural equation model. *Studia Psychologica*, 53(3):263, 2011.
- [2] Livingston Alexander and Carl Martray. The development of an abbreviated version of the mathematics anxiety rating scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in counseling and development*, 22(3):143–150, 1989.
- [3] Abbas Amani, Hassan Alamolhodaei, Reza Ghanbari, and Farzad Radmehr. An epidemiological model for predicting students' mathematics anxiety. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Mathematics*, 24(4):793–805, 2021.
- [4] Luanne M Amato. Barriers to a stem career: Math anxiety and the adult female. In *Handbook of Research on Social Inequality and Education*, pages 64–90. IGI Global, 2019.
- [5] Mark H Ashcraft. Math anxiety: Personal, educational, and cognitive consequences. *Current directions in psychological science*, 11(5):181–185, 2002.
- [6] Mark H Ashcraft and Alex M Moore. Mathematics anxiety and the affective drop in performance. *Journal of Psychoeducational assessment*, 27(3):197–205, 2009.

- [7] Mark H Ashcraft and Kelly S Ridley. Math anxiety and its cognitive consequences: A tutorial review. *The handbook of mathematical cognition*, pages 315–327, 2005.
- [8] John Baer. Grouping and achievement in cooperative learning. *College teaching*, 51(4):169–175, 2003.
- [9] Miriam Balt, Moritz Börnert-Ringleb, and Lars Orbach. Reducing math anxiety in school children: A systematic review of intervention research. In *Frontiers in Education*, volume 7, page 798516. Frontiers Media SA, 2022.
- [10] Shweta Bansal, Bryan T Grenfell, and Lauren Ancel Meyers. When individual behaviour matters: homogeneous and network models in epidemiology. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 4(16):879–891, 2007.
- [11] Connie Barroso, Colleen M Ganley, Amanda L McGraw, Elyssa A Geer, Sara A Hart, and Mia C Daucourt. A meta-analysis of the relation between math anxiety and math achievement. *Psychological bulletin*, 147(2):134, 2021.
- [12] Melissa Batton. *The effect of cooperative groups on math anxiety*. Walden University, 2010.
- [13] Sian L Beilock, Elizabeth A Gunderson, Gerardo Ramirez, and Susan C Levine. Female teachers’ math anxiety affects girls’ math achievement. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(5):1860–1863, 2010.
- [14] Carmela Bernardo, Claudio Altafini, Anton Proskurnikov, and Francesco Vasca. Bounded confidence opinion dynamics: A survey. *Automatica*, 159:111302, 2024.
- [15] Christie Blazer. Strategies for reducing math anxiety. information capsule. volume 1102. *Research Services, Miami-Dade County Public Schools*, 2011.
- [16] Heather Z Brooks and Mason A Porter. A model for the influence of media on the ideology of content in online social networks. *Physical Review Research*, 2(2):023041, 2020.
- [17] Bettina J Casad, Patricia Hale, and Faye L Wachs. Parent-child math anxiety and math-gender stereotypes predict adolescents’ math education outcomes. *Frontiers in psychology*, 6:158682, 2015.
- [18] Boris Cernilec, Mara Cotic, Darjo Felda, and Daniel Doz. Differences in students’ mathematics knowledge in homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. *European Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 11(1):15–32, 2023.
- [19] Hyesang Chang and Sian L Beilock. The math anxiety-math performance link and its relation to individual and environmental factors: A review of current behavioral and psychophysiological research. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 10:33–38, 2016.
- [20] Bernard Chazelle and Chu Wang. Inertial hegselmann-krause systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(8):3905–3913, 2016.

- [21] Katelyn M Cooper, Virginia R Downing, and Sara E Brownell. The influence of active learning practices on student anxiety in large-enrollment college science classrooms. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 5:1–18, 2018.
- [22] Elisabetta Cornacchia, Neta Singer, and Emmanuel Abbe. Polarization in attraction-repulsion models. In *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 2765–2770. IEEE, 2020.
- [23] Chad Crawford, Logan Brooks, and Sandip Sen. Opposites repel: the effect of incorporating repulsion on opinion dynamics in the bounded confidence model. In *AAMAS*, pages 1225–1226, 2013.
- [24] Richard J Daker, Sylvia U Gattas, H Moriah Sokolowski, Adam E Green, and Ian M Lyons. First-year students’ math anxiety predicts stem avoidance and underperformance throughout university, independently of math ability. *Npj Science of Learning*, 6(1):17, 2021.
- [25] Saeed Daneshamooz and Hassan Alamolhodaei. Cooperative learning and academic hardness on students’ mathematical performance with different levels of mathematics anxiety. *Educational Research*, 3(3):270–276, 2012.
- [26] Guillaume Deffuant, David Neau, Frederic Amblard, and Gérard Weisbuch. Mixing beliefs among interacting agents. *Advances in Complex Systems*, 3(01n04):87–98, 2000.
- [27] Ann Dowker, Amar Sarkar, and Chung Yen Looi. Mathematics anxiety: What have we learned in 60 years? *Frontiers in psychology*, 7:164557, 2016.
- [28] Benjamin J England, Jennifer R Brigati, and Elisabeth E Schussler. Student anxiety in introductory biology classrooms: Perceptions about active learning and persistence in the major. *PloS one*, 12(8):e0182506, 2017.
- [29] Bernhard Ertl, Silke Luttenberger, and Manuela Paechter. The impact of gender stereotypes on the self-concept of female students in stem subjects with an under-representation of females. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8:253122, 2017.
- [30] Maureen Finlayson. Addressing math anxiety in the classroom. *Improving Schools*, 17(1):99–115, 2014.
- [31] Santo Fortunato. On the consensus threshold for the opinion dynamics of krause–hegselmann. *International Journal of Modern Physics C*, 16(02):259–270, 2005.
- [32] Marcia Gentry. Commentary on “does sorting students improve scores? an analysis of class composition”. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 27(2):124–130, 2016.
- [33] Jesús Giráldez-Cru, Carmen Zarco, and Oscar Córdón. Analyzing the extremization of opinions in a general framework of bounded confidence and repulsion. *Information Sciences*, 609:1256–1270, 2022.

- [34] Hudson Golino, Angeline S Lillard, Ian Becker, and Alexander P Christensen. Investigating the structure of the children’s concentration and empathy scale using exploratory graph analysis. *Psychological Test Adaptation and Development*, 2021.
- [35] Benjamin J Gorvine and H David Smith. Predicting student success in a psychological statistics course emphasizing collaborative learning. *Teaching of Psychology*, 42(1):56–59, 2015.
- [36] A Gurin, G Jeanneret, M Pearson, M Pulley, A Salinas, and CW Castillo-Garsow. The dynamics of math anxiety as it is transferred through peer and teacher interactions. Technical report, Tech. Rep. MTBI-14-05M, Arizona State University, 2017.
- [37] Rainer Hegselmann and Ulrich Krause. Opinion dynamics and bounded confidence models, analysis, and simulation. *Journal of artificial societies and social simulation*, 5(3), 2002.
- [38] Ray Hembree. The nature, effects, and relief of mathematics anxiety. *Journal for research in mathematics education*, 21(1):33–46, 1990.
- [39] Abigail Hickok, Yacoub Kureh, Heather Z Brooks, Michelle Feng, and Mason A Porter. A bounded-confidence model of opinion dynamics on hypergraphs. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 21(1):1–32, 2022.
- [40] Simon Hooper and Michael J Hannafin. Cooperative cbi: The effects of heterogeneous versus homogeneous grouping on the learning of progressively complex concepts. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 4(4):413–424, 1988.
- [41] Derek R Hopko, Rajan Mahadevan, Robert L Bare, and Melissa K Hunt. The abbreviated math anxiety scale (amas) construction, validity, and reliability. *Assessment*, 10(2):178–182, 2003.
- [42] Changwei Huang, Qionglin Dai, Wenchen Han, Yuee Feng, Hongyan Cheng, and Haihong Li. Effects of heterogeneous convergence rate on consensus in opinion dynamics. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 499:428–435, 2018.
- [43] Xiaoxia Huang, Jie Zhang, and Laura Hudson. Impact of math self-efficacy, math anxiety, and growth mindset on math and science career interest for middle school students: the gender moderating effect. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 34:621–640, 2019.
- [44] Barbara Hunt. The effect on mathematics achievement and attitude of homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping of gifted sixth-grade students. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 8(2):65–73, 1996.
- [45] Jason C Immekus, Tai-sun Jeong, and Jin Eun Yoo. Machine learning procedures for predictor variable selection for schoolwork-related anxiety: evidence from pisa 2015 mathematics, reading, and science assessments. *Large-scale Assessments in Education*, 10(1):30, 2022.
- [46] David W Johnson and Roger T Johnson. Making cooperative learning work. *Theory into practice*, 38(2):67–73, 1999.

- [47] David W Johnson, Roger T Johnson, and Mary Beth Stanne. Cooperative learning methods: A meta-analysis. 2000.
- [48] Unchitta Kan, Michelle Feng, and Mason A Porter. An adaptive bounded-confidence model of opinion dynamics on networks. *Journal of Complex Networks*, 11(1):415–444, 2023.
- [49] Richard Kazelskis, Carolyn Reeves, ME Kersh, Gahan Bailey, Katherine Cole, Marilyn Larmon, Lew Hall, and DC Holliday. Mathematics anxiety and test anxiety: Separate constructs? *The Journal of experimental education*, 68(2):137–146, 2000.
- [50] Alison King. From sage on the stage to guide on the side. *College teaching*, 41(1):30–35, 1993.
- [51] Gang Kou, Yiyi Zhao, Yi Peng, and Yong Shi. Multi-level opinion dynamics under bounded confidence. 2012.
- [52] Peter Kutnick, Judy Sebba, Peter Blatchford, Maurice Galton, Jo Thorp, H MacIntyre, and L Berdondini. The effects of pupil grouping: Literature review. *Nottingham: DfES Publications*, 2005.
- [53] Michael Laakasuo, Anna Rotkirch, Max Van Duijn, Venla Berg, Markus Jokela, Tamas David-Barrett, Anneli Miettinen, Eiluned Pearce, and Robin Dunbar. Homophily in personality enhances group success among real-life friends. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11:710, 2020.
- [54] Masoud Gholamali Lavasani, Elahe Hejazi, and Javad Yazdani Varzaneh. The predicting model of math anxiety: The role of classroom goal structure, self-regulation and math self-efficacy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15:557–562, 2011.
- [55] Masoud Gholamali Lavasani and Farah Khandan. The effect of cooperative learning on mathematics anxiety and help seeking behavior. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15:271–276, 2011.
- [56] Grace Li. *Some Generalizations of Bounded-Confidence Models of Opinion Dynamics*. PhD thesis, UCLA, 2024.
- [57] Grace J Li, Jiajie Luo, and Mason A Porter. Bounded-confidence models of opinion dynamics with adaptive confidence bounds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07563*, 2023.
- [58] Grace J Li and Mason A Porter. Bounded-confidence model of opinion dynamics with heterogeneous node-activity levels. *Physical Review Research*, 5(2):023179, 2023.
- [59] Jin Li and Renbin Xiao. Agent-based modelling approach for multidimensional opinion polarization in collective behaviour. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 20(2), 2017.

- [60] Liora Linchevski and Bilha Kutscher. Tell me with whom you're learning, and i'll tell you how much you've learned: Mixed-ability versus same-ability grouping in mathematics. *Journal for research in mathematics education*, pages 533–554, 1998.
- [61] Norma A Lopez-Reyna. The relation of interactions and story quality among mexican american and anglo american students with learning disabilities. *Exceptionality*, 7(4):245–261, 1997.
- [62] Jan Lorenz. Continuous opinion dynamics under bounded confidence: A survey. *International Journal of Modern Physics C*, 18(12):1819–1838, 2007.
- [63] Jan Lorenz. Fostering consensus in multidimensional continuous opinion dynamics under bounded confidence. *Managing complexity: Insights, concepts, applications*, pages 321–334, 2008.
- [64] Jan Lorenz. Heterogeneous bounds of confidence: meet, discuss and find consensus! *Complexity*, 15(4):43–52, 2010.
- [65] Silke Luttenberger, Sigrid Wimmer, and Manuela Paechter. Spotlight on math anxiety. *Psychology research and behavior management*, pages 311–322, 2018.
- [66] Xin Ma and Jiangming Xu. The causal ordering of mathematics anxiety and mathematics achievement: a longitudinal panel analysis. *Journal of adolescence*, 27(2):165–179, 2004.
- [67] Margherita Malanchini, Kaili Rimfeld, Nicholas G Shakeshaft, Maja Rodic, Kerry Schofield, Saskia Selzam, Philip S Dale, Stephen A Petrill, and Yulia Kovas. The genetic and environmental aetiology of spatial, mathematics and general anxiety. *Scientific reports*, 7(1):42218, 2017.
- [68] Ahmed M Megreya and Ahmed A Al-Emadi. The impacts of math anxiety, science anxiety, and gender on arts versus sciences choices in qatari secondary schools. *PeerJ*, 11:e14510, 2023.
- [69] Ahmed M Megreya, Denes Szűcs, and Ahmed A Moustafa. The abbreviated science anxiety scale: Psychometric properties, gender differences and associations with test anxiety, general anxiety and science achievement. *PLoS One*, 16(2):e0245200, 2021.
- [70] X Flora Meng, Robert A Van Gorder, and Mason A Porter. Opinion formation and distribution in a bounded-confidence model on various networks. *Physical Review E*, 97(2):022312, 2018.
- [71] Karen Newstead. Aspects of children's mathematics anxiety. *Educational Studies in mathematics*, 36:53–71, 1998.
- [72] Gerardo Ramirez, Stacy T Shaw, and Erin A Maloney. Math anxiety: Past research, promising interventions, and a new interpretation framework. *Educational psychologist*, 53(3):145–164, 2018.

- [73] Lars Rass and Jan Treur. A computational model for the second-order adaptive causal relationships between anxiety, stress and physical exercise. In *Artificial Intelligence Applications and Innovations: 17th IFIP WG 12.5 International Conference, AIAI 2021, Hersonissos, Crete, Greece, June 25–27, 2021, Proceedings 17*, pages 17–29. Springer, 2021.
- [74] Frank C Richardson and Richard M Suinn. The mathematics anxiety rating scale: psychometric data. *Journal of counseling Psychology*, 19(6):551, 1972.
- [75] Hendrik Schawe, Sylvain Fontaine, and Laura Hernández. When network bridges foster consensus. bounded confidence models in networked societies. *Physical Review Research*, 3(2):023208, 2021.
- [76] Toni Schmader. Gender identification moderates stereotype threat effects on women’s math performance. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 38(2):194–201, 2002.
- [77] Kenny Skagerlund, Rickard Östergren, Daniel Västfjäll, and Ulf Träff. How does mathematics anxiety impair mathematical abilities? investigating the link between math anxiety, working memory, and number processing. *PloS one*, 14(1):e0211283, 2019.
- [78] Robert E Slavin. Research on cooperative learning and achievement: What we know, what we need to know. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 21(1):43–69, 1996.
- [79] Dilek Soysal, Majid Bani-Yaghoub, and Tiffani A Riggers-Piehl. A machine learning approach to evaluate variables of math anxiety in stem students. *Pedagogical Research*, 7(2), 2022.
- [80] Savannah Spilotro. *A Theoretical Model and Study of Mathematical Anxiety*. PhD thesis, 2018.
- [81] Massimo Stella. Network psychometrics and cognitive network science open new ways for understanding math anxiety as a complex system. *Journal of Complex Networks*, 10(3):cnac012, 2022.
- [82] Jiongming Su, Baohong Liu, Qi Li, and Hongxu Ma. Coevolution of opinions and directed adaptive networks in a social group. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 17(2):4, 2014.
- [83] Shewafera Wondimagegnhu Teklu. Analysis of fractional order model on higher institution students’ anxiety towards mathematics with optimal control theory. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):6867, 2023.
- [84] Shewafera Wondimagegnhu Teklu and Birhanu Baye Terefe. Mathematical modeling analysis on the dynamics of university students animosity towards mathematics with optimal control theory. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):11578, 2022.
- [85] Sheila Tobias. *Overcoming math anxiety*. WW Norton & Company, 1993.

- [86] Michael AR Townsend, Dennis W Moore, Bryan F Tuck, and Keri M Wilton. Self-concept and anxiety in university students studying social science statistics within a co-operative learning structure. *Educational Psychology*, 18(1):41–54, 1998.
- [87] Justin W Weeks, Thomas L Rodebaugh, Richard G Heimberg, Peter J Norton, and Tejal A Jakatdar. “to avoid evaluation, withdraw”: fears of evaluation and depressive cognitions lead to social anxiety and submissive withdrawal. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 33:375–389, 2009.
- [88] Gérard Weisbuch, Guillaume Deffuant, Frédéric Amblard, and Jean-Pierre Nadal. Meet, discuss, and segregate! *Complexity*, 7(3):55–63, 2002.
- [89] Michael Wiedmann, Ryan C Leach, Nikol Rummel, and Jennifer Wiley. Does group composition affect learning by invention? *Instructional Science*, 40:711–730, 2012.
- [90] Allan Wigfield and Judith L Meece. Math anxiety in elementary and secondary school students. *Journal of educational Psychology*, 80(2):210, 1988.
- [91] Pia Williams and Sonja Sheridan. Collaboration as one aspect of quality: A perspective of collaboration and pedagogical quality in educational settings. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 50(1):83–93, 2006.

6 Appendix




Figure A1: Effect of parameters on equilibrium dynamics for small classrooms, $N = 10$ students. Coupling is all-to-all: $A_{ij}^t \equiv 1$. Trends are similar as in the $N = 30$ case, though the non-monotone behavior of γ is more dramatic for small ε .




Figure A2: Effect of parameters on equilibrium dynamics for large classrooms, $N = 100$ students. Coupling is all-to-all: $A_{ij}^t \equiv 1$. Trends are similar as in the $N = 30$ case.




Figure A3: Histograms of data from Monte Carlo simulations for $\gamma = 0.95$ and $\varepsilon = 0.1$. We see that the change in anxiety is roughly centered around 0, though there is a negative skew. This is also reflected in the histogram for final anxieties where there is a peak at 0. This is expected since students with low anxieties (e.g., below ε) will generally converge to 0. Means of both distributions are near 0.5.




Figure A4: Representative dynamics of various forms of group work. **a)** Randomly assigned groups of size 2, **b)** Randomly assigned groups of size 3, and **c)** Homogeneous groups (ordered by initial anxiety) of size 3. Other parameters: $N = 30$, $\gamma = 0.95$, and $\varepsilon = 0.1$.




Figure A5: Histogram of Monte Carlo data showing the change of anxiety and final anxieties of students when placed into groups of size 2 randomly. While a significant proportion of students do not change anxiety, those who do become generally quite polarized (see also Figure A4 **a**). Other parameters: $N = 30$, $\gamma = 0.95$, and $\varepsilon = 0.1$.




Figure A6: Histogram of Monte Carlo data showing the change of anxiety and final anxieties of students when placed into groups of size 3 randomly. Compared to groups of size 2, there is a large population of students whose anxiety is middling ≈ 0.5 . Even if one group member leads to an increase of anxiety for a student, the mediating interaction of a third student provides a mechanism for the student to lower anxiety (see also Figure A4 **b**). Other parameters: $N = 30$, $\gamma = 0.95$, and $\varepsilon = 0.1$.




Figure A7: Histogram of Monte Carlo data showing the change of anxiety and final anxieties of students when placed into groups of size 3 homogeneously by initial anxiety levels. Compared to randomly formed groups of size 3, anxiety levels for a significant population of students decreases to 0. This is an artifact of the grouping strategy which promotes the number of “positive” peer interactions (see also Figure A4 c). Other parameters: $N = 30$, $\gamma = 0.95$, and $\varepsilon = 0.1$.




Figure A8: Histogram of Monte Carlo data showing the change of anxiety and final anxieties of students when placed into groups of size 3 randomly which are periodically switched over time. **a)** Changing every $t = 20$ timesteps has the surprising effect of worsening anxiety when compared to keeping groups fixed. **b)** On the other hand, changing every $t = 70$ timesteps dramatically lowers anxiety levels overall. Other parameters: $N = 30$, $\gamma = 0.95$, and $\varepsilon = 0.1$.




Figure A9: The effect of changing randomly formed groups of size 2 periodically. **a)** Data at 0 represents keeping groups fixed for all time and serves as a baseline. Qualitatively, results are similar as the case of groups of size 3. **b)** Representative simulation switching groups every $t = 20$ timesteps and **c)** every $t = 100$ timesteps. Other parameters: $N = 30$, $\gamma = 0.95$, and $\varepsilon = 0.1$.




Figure A10: The effect of changing randomly formed groups of size 4 periodically. **a)** Data at 0 represents keeping groups fixed for all time and serves as a baseline. Qualitatively, results are similar as the case of groups of size 3. **b)** Representative simulation switching groups every $t = 20$ timesteps and **c)** every $t = 100$ timesteps. Other parameters: $N = 30$, $\gamma = 0.95$, and $\varepsilon = 0.1$.