

Office Hours and Online Forum Engagement in Introductory CS Courses

Alice Wanner
Computer Science
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia
cfj3jd@virginia.edu

Ryan Lenfant
Computer Science
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia
rpl8af@virginia.edu

Michelle Cheng
Computer Science
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia
rfp3uz@virginia.edu

Thomas Lam
Computer Science
Columbia University
New York, New York
thomas.lam@columbia.edu

Raymond Pettit
Computer Science
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia
raymond.pettit@virginia.edu

John R. Hott
Computer Science
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia
jrhott@virginia.edu

Abstract—This research full paper explores the connection between office hours use and online forum engagement in introductory computer science courses. Office hours (OH) and online question-and-answer (Q&A) forums provide a platform for students to interact with their classmates and instructors. We investigate the relationship between student engagement in an online discussion forum (Piazza) and utilization of office hours across 5 semesters of an introductory CS course. We explored the correlation between Piazza utilization and OH attendance, discerned disparities between in-person and online OH involvement, and analyzed the distinct approaches of men and women in engaging with course resources. We found that active Piazza users visit OH more than inactive Piazza users. More specifically, students who interact above average on Piazza in each metric observed — asks, answers, posts, and views — attend OH more than those who are below average in each metric. Additionally, students who attend OH at least once tend to post, ask, answer, and view posts on Piazza more frequently than those who have never attended OH. This indicates that above average help-seeking students on Piazza and in OH tend to engage with available resources more than those who did not seek help as often. This quantifies how often — and through which methods — students seek help. Based on prior research and our findings, we find it likely that students often begin by seeking answers on Piazza. If they find the response unsatisfactory, they then resort to OH for clarification. We also examined the modality of office hours, comparing in-person and online interactions; there is no significant statistical difference in the number of OH visits between those who attend virtually vs those who attend in person. However, online OH visits tended to take longer than in-person visits. In terms of the relationship between engagement and gender, our findings show that women visit OH more than men, both in person and online, and take longer in their OH visits. These findings emphasize the importance of course engagement resources in assisting with learning while also highlighting factors that affect engagement, such as gender, mode of engagement, and usage of other resources, giving instructors a better understanding of which populations tend to engage with specific course resources.

Index Terms—engagement, help-seeking, office hours, online communities, piazza, gender, cs1

I. INTRODUCTION

Maintaining interactions between professors and students is vital for course engagement [1] and a reliable predictor of academic performance [2]; however, there are a multitude of methods to engage students seeking help [2]. Office hours (OH) are among the most widely used methods for supporting students' learning, although other methods, such as online discussion forums, are gaining popularity [3]. A prominent example of such a forum is Piazza [4]. These online resources allow students to interact with professors, teaching assistants, and students alike. Our study aims to understand the connection between office hours and online course forums to explore student help-seeking behavior in higher education. Prior studies have highlighted that office hours are a valuable resource in a student's academic performance [3], [5], and have been shown to be beneficial to student learning [6]. However, they are often underutilized by students [3], [7]. Furthermore, not all populations use office hours in the same way. A 2021 study observed that women attended office hours more than men [8]. These findings were confirmed by Gao et al. [9], who also found that women attended office hours, both online and in person, more than men. Understanding how students utilize office hours may help measure engagement of students within the course.

We also examine how course mode, such as in-person and online, impacts help-seeking behavior. According to Kitsantas and Chow, students seek help differently depending on the mode of the course, including in-person, hybrid, and online courses [10]. However, it is unclear the effect that course mode offering has on resource utilization. They found that students asked for help in online courses more than in-person classes, while feeling less threatened to ask for assistance [10]. This implies that web-based courses facilitate more help-seeking among students [10]. However, Mahasneh et al. in 2012 compared help-seeking in online and in-person courses,

finding that students in online courses asked considerably fewer questions than students in the in-person section [11].

In this study, we analyze data on OH and Piazza utilization over the course of several semesters that included in-person, hybrid, and online modalities to better understand student help-seeking behavior. By connecting these data, we can gain further insight into student resource utilization. Our research questions are as follows:

- RQ1: What is the relationship between student engagement on Piazza and in office hours?
- RQ2: How does engagement with in-person and online office hours differ?
- RQ3: Do men and women utilize course resources differently?

II. BACKGROUND/ RELATED WORK

A. Office Hours

In the context of this work, we define office hours (OH) as times in which students can seek one-on-one help from instructors and teaching assistants. OH provide an opportunity for students to meet with their professors outside the classroom, which has shown to be beneficial to student learning [6] by improving their motivation to learn [12], overall satisfaction with college [13], and academic performance [14]. Despite potential benefits to learning, students and instructors often have a negative view of office hours; however, of the factors that affect OH attendance, such as time, location, and perception of online forums, only one — usefulness of feedback — was in the control of the instructors [7]. Delany et al. found that students do not try to meet with professors due to time constraints and insecurity [15]. Furthermore, students may fear embarrassment and appearing foolish to their professors [6]. Given the barriers to participation in office hours, it is important to look at alternative ways to increase student-faculty interaction. One such option is virtual office hours. Edwards et al. found that students feel virtual office hours provided an easier path to meet with the professor; however, only 12% of students joined virtually [16]. Examining how students attend office hours may be useful to measure their engagement with a course.

It is also vital to understand why students attend office hours. Students seek help in their courses for a multitude of reasons, with the difficulty of the problem being the biggest predictor of help-seeking [17]. Generally, office hours have been proven to positively correlate with academic performance in computer science courses [18], as well as non-STEM courses [5]. However, the ways in which office hours are used by students can also impact the correlation between office hour utilization and academic performance. Hall et al. found that office hours positively correlated with academic performance if students spent a considerable amount of time individually working on the assignment before seeking help, as opposed to students who demonstrated low preparation before attending office hours [18]. In 2023, Ko et al. suggested that students have rigid views on attending office hours before the course

starts, that their first interaction has little to do with their engagement for the course, and that office hour engagement tends to be higher near assignment deadlines [19].

Additionally, we must also consider the mode of office hours — online or in-person — when assessing efficacy. Virtual video chat platforms, such as *Zoom*¹ and *Discord*², can be effective venues for holding office hours in a virtual setting. Through a questionnaire study, Michael et al. found that 54% of students felt that virtual office hours supported their learning but 58% of students indicated that their ideal method of communication with course staff was in person [20]. Students were more likely to attend office hours if the time and location were convenient, but instructors lack control over influencing student OH attendance [7]. On the other hand, Li et al. found that student use of virtual office hours did not significantly differ from use of in-person office hours [21]. Regarding satisfaction after attending office hours, they found that students who attended virtually were more satisfied with the help they received [21].

B. Online Discussion Forums

Piazza is an online discussion forum that allows for students and instructors to ask and answer questions, mimicking group communication in an online setting [4]. The inspiration for Piazza came from its founder's experience being one of the few women studying computer science at an engineering school [4]. Thus, Piazza was created with a goal of decreasing feelings of isolation among women studying computer science [22]. Multiple studies found that women in STEM courses were more likely to post anonymously than men [22]–[24]. However, trends of women posting anonymously more often on Piazza can be harmful since it perpetuates the perception that CS courses are male dominated, when the actual distribution is more even [25]. In general, students tend to use the anonymity feature more in larger classes and answer fewer questions on average [26]. Piazza has also been used to boost overall course engagement and was found to be a helpful resource to a third of students, as indicated by survey conducted by Ghannam et al. in 2019 [27]. Despite satisfaction with Piazza as a resource for learning, the students were displeased that only a quarter of their peers contributed to answering questions [27]. Engagement has been shown to have a “significant effect” on the academic achievement of students [28], and utilizing Piazza is a form of course engagement [24]. Specifically regarding the types of questions asked on Piazza, better learning outcomes resulted from questions in which the students explained their own reasoning [29].

III. METHODOLOGY

We collected data from 5 semesters of the introductory CS course at a residential university. The course is a requirement for many majors at the University of Virginia and was taught using weekly assignments and quizzes, weekly participation in lab, and programming assessments. The semesters analyzed were Fall 2019, Spring 2020, Spring 2021, Fall 2021, and

¹<https://zoom.us/>

²<https://discord.com/>

Spring 2022. The Fall 2019 semester held only in-person office hours; the Spring 2021 semester held only online office hours. Other semesters held hybrid office hours; namely, a mixture of modalities, with online OH on different days of the week. In Spring 2020, in-person office hours were offered until March 7, 2020, with all office hours after that date being conducted online due to the Covid-19 pandemic. We collected OH data and online forum engagement data from the OH system used in the courses, Kytos Queuing System and Piazza, respectively.

1) *Office Hour Data*: Kytos Queuing System is an office hour queuing system created for use in multiple courses at the University of Virginia. It logs the *action*, *student id*, *instructor id*, *location*, and *time* any action takes place. With regards to the various actions, students send a “request” for help which puts them in the queue to wait until the next available teaching assistant (TA) can assist them. A student can also “retract” their request if they no longer need assistance. TAs “help” students when the student is at the top of the queue and is then selected. Once being helped, TAs can “unhelp” the student and put them back on the queue, or finish helping the student and “resolve” the “request” formed by the student.

2) *Online Forum Data*: Piazza has two types of users, “students” and “instructors”. Both TAs and professors are considered “instructors”. Students have the ability to post anonymously or with their name visible; however, in the courses studied, posts were never anonymous to instructors. Students may post “questions” to which other students can provide a “student answer” or an instructor can provide an “instructor answer”. Additionally, within each question there is a section for any users to follow up on either the question or answers. Other types of posts include “polls”, which are questions with predetermined answer choices, and “notes”, which are posts with no answer fields.

3) *Data Synthesis and Gender*: We employed a script to connect the OH and Piazza data using each user’s university-assigned computing identifier. Each user was then assigned a unique number and perceived gender across both data sets. All identifying information, such as a user’s name, computing id, and email, was replaced with anonymous data. As neither data set notes a user’s gender and the researchers did not have access to a user’s self reported gender identity, we utilized two packages – *genderComputer*³ and *gender-guesser*⁴ – to infer the perceived gender of each user. These packages take a user’s name as input and output “male”, “female”, or “unknown”. Names were first classified using *genderComputer*, and if it returned “unknown”, were then classified through *gender-guesser*. We recognize that not all individuals identify with gender as a binary, however, for the purpose of this study, we use the terms “woman” and “man” to refer to those who identify as such. The libraries available for usage are only able to classify names as “male”, “female” or “unknown” and we map these outputs to “man” and “woman” respectively. Sharma et al. criticized identifying gender using tools such

as *genderComputer* and *gender-guesser* due to their inaccuracies [30]. We acknowledge that gender data cannot be fully accurate without self identification, however they provide a rough approximation in absence of self reported identification.

A. Data Analysis

We used the Mann-Whitney U test to determine the significance of the results in relation to the research questions [31]. This test determines the difference between two groups of different sizes (such as students who attend OH and students who do not attend OH) on a single variable (such as the number of questions asked) and reports if the two populations are similar or different based on that single variable [31]. The Mann-Whitney test calculates a statistic U and compares the result with its distribution under the null hypothesis, generating a p -value. The results become more statistically significant for lower p -values. Traditionally a p -value of less than 0.05 is considered to determine statistical significance. Thus if the p -value is below our defined significance level, $p < 0.05$, we reject the null hypothesis. Additionally, due to the nature of the Mann-Whitney test to compare two populations, if p -value > 0.95 , then the alternative hypothesis is accepted for the other population; running the same test in the other direction would result in rejecting the null hypothesis for the opposite comparison. For example, if $p > 0.999$ and the alternative hypothesis was OH attending students answer more questions on Piazza than those who do not attend OH, then the accepted hypothesis is that OH attending students answer fewer or equally as many questions on Piazza as those who do not attend OH. We use Cohen’s d test [32] to measure the effect size, where higher d values represent greater differences in the means.

B. Piazza and Office Hour Relationship

Our first goal was to understand the relationship between Piazza and OH utilization. We use the following metrics to measure engagement in OH and Piazza and quantify the relationship between them. In each metric, a user is labeled as *active* if their statistics were above average in the respective metric. If a user’s statistic for a metric was lower than average, they would be considered *inactive*. For example, an *active* asker posts an above average number of questions within their respective course.

- 1) The *number of OH visits* of
 - Active Piazza posters vs Inactive posters;
 - Active Piazza answerers vs Inactive answerers;
 - Active Piazza askers vs Inactive askers; and
 - Active Piazza viewers vs Inactive viewers.
- 2) Piazza engagement of OH attendees vs those who have not attended OH, defined by
 - The *number of posts* asked by a user;
 - The *number of questions* asked by a user;
 - The *number of answers* given by a user; and
 - The *viewership* - measured by the percentage of posts viewed by a user.

³<https://github.com/tue-mdse/genderComputer>

⁴<https://pypi.org/project/gender-guesser/>

TABLE I
PIAZZA OH VISITS SIGNIFICANCE

Active Piazza Users			Inactive Piazza Users			Significance		
Name	Size	Avg. OH Visits	Name	Size	Avg. OH Visits	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d_{Cohen}</i>
Active Poster	362	11.93	Inactive Posters	1262	7.67	176060.5	<0.001*	0.4391
Active Asker	494	11.39	Inactive Asker	1130	7.41	218735.00	<0.001*	0.4105
Active Answerer	113	10.82	Inactive Answerer	1511	8.46	70881.0	<0.001*	0.2403
Active Viewer	643	9.63	Inactive Viewer	981	7.96	279188.0	<0.001*	0.1704

TABLE II
PIAZZA ENGAGEMENT OF OH ATTENDEES VS NON-ATTENDEES

Metric	OH Attendees (n = 1624)	OH Non-Attendees (n = 1699)	Significance		
	Avg. for Metric	Avg. for Metric	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d_{Cohen}</i>
Posts	2.77	1.19	1031632.0	<0.001*	0.3455
Questions	1.64	0.60	1030709.0	<0.001*	0.4258
Answers	0.46	0.28	1300220.0	<0.001*	0.0951
% Posts Viewed	18.85%	13.71%	1063944.0	<0.001*	0.2693

We chose these metrics to determine if students who engage on Piazza also utilize office hours. The first metric, with regard to OH visits, determines if students who actively use Piazza attend OH more than those who do not use Piazza. The other metrics aim to uncover which students make use of OH; are they the students who have more questions, provide more answers, and/or view a majority of posts?

We form a null and alternative hypothesis for each metric. The null hypotheses suggest no difference in the number of *office hour visits* for above average posters, askers, answerers, and viewers, and no difference in the *number of questions asked*, *answers given*, and *viewership* between OH attendees and those who do not attend OH. Alternative hypotheses suggest that above average posters, askers, answerers, and viewers attend office hours more and people who attend OH ask more questions, provide more answers, and view a larger proportion of posts.

C. In-Person vs Online Office Hours

The location of office hours may have an impact on student attendance and experience. The difference between in-person and online office hours was observed through the following metrics:

- The *number of visits*;
- The *help time*; and
- The *combined wait and help time*.

These metrics provide insight on the preferred office hour mode for our population. *Help time* refers to the session with the student and instructor, but combined wait and help time includes the time the student waited in the queue to the length of the help session. As total time could impact which mode of OH to attend, we observed how much time a student had to wait and for how long they were helped. The null hypotheses suggest that there is no difference in the *number of visits*, the *help time*, and the *combined wait and help time* between online and in-person OH. The alternative hypotheses suggest that online office hours have shorter *help times*, and have shorter *combined wait and help time*.

D. Men vs Women in OH

A subset of this study an observation of the differences between women and men in office hours. The metrics observed were:

- The *number of visits*;
- The *number of online visits*;
- The *number of in-person visits*;
- The *help time*; and
- The *combined wait and help time*.

We compare the number of office hour visits between men and women to observe the help-seeking behaviour of each population. The null hypotheses suggest there is no difference in the amount of visits, time to be helped, and total time to join the queue and be helped between men and women. The alternative hypotheses suggest that women visit office hours more, have longer help times, and have longer times to join the queue and be helped as compared to men.

IV. RESULTS

There were a total of 3323 students and 271 instructors. Of the students, 903 used both Piazza and OH, 576 used only Piazza, 721 used only OH, and 1123 did not use either resource. Furthermore, 1648 of the students were classified as men, 1338 were classified as women, and 337 could not be inferred as either.

A. Piazza and Office Hour Relationship

The significance tests for the relationship between Piazza and Office Hours can be seen in Table I and Table II. Table I shows OH visitation data for Piazza active vs inactive students: the number of users, average OH visits, and significance for active and inactive posters, askers, answerers, and viewers. Active posters, askers, answerers, and viewers attend OH more than inactive students. The effect size suggests the difference for posters, askers, and answerers is small, and the difference for viewers is negligible. Table II shows the comparison of Piazza engagement between students who attend OH and those that do not attend. Students who attend provide more posts, questions, answers, and view a larger percentage of posts than

TABLE III
IN-PERSON VS ONLINE OH

Metric	In-Person OH		Online OH		Significance		
	Stud. Count	Avg. for Metric	Stud. Count	Avg. for Metric	U	p	d_{Cohen}
Visits	1014	7.04	990	6.90	483044.5	0.071	0.0173
Help Time	989	00:36:12	954	00:37:40	17964426.5	0.032*	0.0331
Wait + Help Time	979	01:20:17	944	01:45:13	15769556.0	<0.001*	0.2441

TABLE IV
MEDIAN HELP TIMES

Population 1			Population 2		
Name	Size	Median Time	Name	Size	Median
In-Person OH (Help Time)	989	00:18:33	Online OH (Help Time)	954	00:20:00
In-Person OH (Wait+Help Time)	979	00:57:16	Online OH (Wait+Help Time)	944	01:16:48
Men (Help Time)	624	00:18:59	Women (Help Time)	806	00:20:25
Men (Wait+Help Time)	622	01:01:22	Women (Wait+Help Time)	803	01:06:16

TABLE V
WOMEN VS MEN OH STATISTICS

Metric	Women		Men		Significance		
	Stud. Count	Avg. for Metric	Stud. Count	Avg. for Metric	U	p	d_{Cohen}
Total Visits	1058	9.93	781	7.02	328176.0	>0.999*	0.2976
Online Visits	504	7.89	397	5.74	115313.5	>0.999*	0.2768
In-Person Visits	554	7.65	384	6.09	122763.0	>0.999*	0.1791
Help Time	806	00:38:41	624	00:36:53	13935047.5	>0.999*	0.0433
Wait + Help Time	803	01:33:04	622	01:29:09	13747922.5	0.995*	0.0391

those who do not attend. The effect size for posts, questions, and views is small and the effect size for answers is negligible.

B. In-Person vs Online OH

The results comparing the in-person and online office hours statistics are shown in Table III. It displays OH visitation data for in-person vs online office hours: the number of attendees, average OH visits, average time spent, and significance for online vs in-person OH. There is no significant relation between the average number of visits for online and in-person OH. However, both *help time*, and the *combined wait and help time* are longer in online office hours. The medians for *help time* and the *combined wait and help time* for online and in-person OH can be seen in Table IV. The median gives a better indicator of how long each OH session took and shows the difference between online and in-person OH times. The help and wait times were heavy-tailed, with a few long times affecting the mean, even though the bulk of the times were clustered closer to the median. The effect size of combined wait and help times suggests that the difference is small, while the difference for help times is negligible.

C. Men vs Women in OH

The significance tests comparing office hours statistics for men and women are shown in Table V. Table V shows visitation data for men and women in office hours: the number of attendees, average OH visits, average time spent, and significance for men vs women data in both in-person and online OH. There is a significant relationship between all data comparing women and men. Women tend to visit office hours more in both online and in-person formats and have longer

help times. The medians for *help time*, and the *combined wait and help time* can be seen in Table IV. The effect size of total visits and online visits suggests that the difference is small, while the difference in in-person visits, help time, and combined wait and help time are negligible.

V. DISCUSSION

A. OH and Piazza Engagement

Overall, our study observed that students who post, ask, answer, or view Piazza more frequently than the average also attend OH more than their peers. Students who attend OH are more likely to post, ask questions, provide answers, and view more posts than those who do not attend. Thus, students who use Piazza are more likely to utilize OH, and vice versa. This indicates that above average help-seeking students (those who attend OH and those who post on Piazza above average) tend to engage with available resources, namely Piazza and OH, more than those who do not seek help as often. Our findings quantitatively demonstrate how often and through which methods students seek help. We observed that students who seek help above the average tend to utilize both synchronous and asynchronous resources, namely office hours and discussion forums, respectively. Related works can help explain why students engage the way our study observed. Doebling et al. [8] examined help-seeking behavior among students and concluded that students tend to first utilize asynchronous methods of help, including online discussion forums, before opting to use synchronous methods such as OH. Through interviews and surveys, they attributed this trend in help-seeking to students first utilizing the most accessible resources before seeking out less accessible ones [8]. Students

asserted that attending OH was less accessible and also posed the threat of feeling judged by course staff, however they found OH to be quicker and more helpful than other resources [8]. Furthermore, students who were unable to find answers to their questions online may perceive a resource to be less available [33], leading them to attend OH.

Similarly, a Kitsantas and Chow [10] also concluded that students were more likely to seek help from online resources, as they felt less threatened than when seeking help in person. Additionally Cloude et al. [34] compared help seeking in online forums and online office hours, discovering that the online Q&A was more utilized than office hours. They attributed this to the higher accessibility of the discussion forum, since it was available at all times [34]. Based on these works, we believe students first attempt to answer their question through Piazza, due to lower perceived threat and easier access. If the answer is not answered to their satisfaction, or the students prefers OH, they attend OH to get their question answered. Using knowledge learned from OH, students are more able to provide answers on Piazza if fellow students have similar questions. This may explain the relationship between the frequency of OH attendance and the number of answers a student provides on Piazza: not only do students who provide more answers attend OH, but our study shows that above average answerers attend OH more than their peers.

B. In-Person vs Online

With regard to in-person vs online office hours, there was no significant difference between the in-person and online attendance. This contrasts with Gao et al's 2022 study that found increased office hour attendance when offered online [9]. While our study also includes a similar time frame to Gao et al. (Fall 2019 and Fall 2020) [9], our data builds on this time frame and analyzes help seeking behavior in a post pandemic era as well. Even though Gao's study showed students may have utilized significantly more online office hours in Fall 2020 than in Fall 2019 [9], our data spanning from Fall 2019 to Spring 2022 shows a lack of significant preference for online or in person office hours over all semesters. Additionally, we found that online help and combined wait and help times were significantly longer than in person. The results can be explained by observing the disadvantages of online OH. Hsu et al. [35] found that students find it harder to express their thoughts in an online format, had a lack of ability to share written material, had technical problems, and longer times. Supporting the claim that students perceive longer wait times with online OH, Hsu et al. [35] provides insight into why we found that online OH take longer. Technical difficulties and the inability to express ideas can make it harder for TAs or instructors to understand and help students.

C. Men vs Women

The courses in our data set had 40% women, which is higher than the national average of 18% [36], since the courses were introductory and required for a number of majors. The OH statistics for men and women indicates that men visit OH less

for both in-person and online OH, and have shorter help and combined wait and help times as compared to women. Our data does not provide insight into why the help times are longer for women, however, Hsu et al. [35] shows that women prefer online OH over in-person OH, compared to men. Our results agree with their conclusions, however, the pattern of OH attendance in our study shows that women tend to go to both more than men.

VI. THREATS TO VALIDITY

As Piazza and OH data were taken from only one higher level institution, the results may vary from institution to institution. Furthermore, all of the data were collected from introductory level computer science courses, the difference in help-seeking in higher level courses was not examined. As some of the courses were held before and after the COVID-19 pandemic, the mode of teaching was not held consistent between each of the semesters, although the semesters had significant overlap in instructors. Teaching modality could have an impact on the attendance of in-person vs online OH. To account for this, data was taken from courses before, during, and after the effects of COVID-19. Additionally, inferring gender based on name rather than using actual gender identification introduces error. This was due to actual gender data not accessible to researchers.

VII. FUTURE WORK

Although our study observed trends in course resource utilization, it does not describe the factors that determine which resources students opt to use. Particularly it would be beneficial to examine the factors that lead students not to engage with course resources at all. Furthermore, studying the correlation between resource utilization and course performance and understanding would strengthen the implications of this study. Namely, the students who engage with course resources thus performing better than those who do not, or do they simply need more help to perform the same as those who do not engage? Another aspect to consider is the quality of the interactions in each resource: how does this difference affect learning outcomes? These questions regarding students' reasoning for seeking certain resources could be answered in future work. Our study provided quantitative insight to course resource utilization and future quantitative studies could answer the questions from multiple perspectives of why these trends occur.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Student utilization of course resources is important to their success. As shown in this study, students who utilize one course resource also tend to use other resources. Although there is little difference in in-person and online OH attendance between men and women, women are much more likely to attend more often and stay longer in OH. Thus it can be concluded that women tend to engage more with certain course resources than men. Our findings are valuable to give instructors a better understanding of which populations tend

to engage with specific course resources. Furthermore, these quantitative results open many avenues for further research, particularly into the motivations behind why students choose to engage in these ways and the learning outcomes of different forms of engagement.

IX. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study was approved under the University of Virginia Institutional Review Board (IRB)-SBS protocol number 5063.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Morgan, M. Butler, J. Sinclair, C. Gonsalvez, and N. Thota, "Contrasting cs student and academic perspectives and experiences of student engagement," in *Proceedings Companion of the 23rd Annual ACM Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education*, ser. ITiCSE 2018 Companion. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, p. 1–35. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3293881.3295777>
- [2] M. A. Qureshi, A. Khaskheli, J. A. Qureshi, S. A. Raza, and S. Q. Yousufi, "Factors affecting students' learning performance through collaborative learning and engagement," *Interactive Learning Environments*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 2371–2391, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.1884886>
- [3] M. J. Schertzer, R. Robinson, T. Landschoot, A. Ghosh, A. Liberson, and E. Hensel, Jr, "Effect of office hour participation on student performance," in *Volume 5: Education and Globalization*. American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Nov. 2014.
- [4] C. Severance, "Pooja sankar: Building the piazza collaboration system," *Computer*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 6–7, 2013.
- [5] M. Guerrero and A. B. Rod, "Engaging in office hours: A study of student-faculty interaction and academic performance," *Journal of Political Science Education*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 403–416, 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2013.835554>
- [6] E. K. Briody, E. Wirtz, A. Goldenstein, and E. J. Berger, "Breaking the tyranny of office hours: Overcoming professor avoidance," *European Journal of Engineering Education*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 666–687, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2019.1592116>
- [7] W. Griffin, S. D. Cohen, R. Berndtson, K. M. Burson, K. M. Camper, Y. Chen, and M. A. Smith, "Starting the conversation: An exploratory study of factors that influence student office hour use," *Coll. Teach.*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 94–99, 2014.
- [8] A. Doebling and A. M. Kazerouni, "Patterns of academic help-seeking in undergraduate computing students," in *Proceedings of the 21st Koli Calling International Conference on Computing Education Research*, ser. Koli Calling '21. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3488042.3488052>
- [9] Z. Gao, S. Heckman, and C. Lynch, "Who uses office hours? a comparison of in-person and virtual office hours utilization," in *Proceedings of the 53rd ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education - Volume 1*, ser. SIGCSE 2022. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, p. 300–306. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3478431.3499334>
- [10] A. Kitsantas and A. Chow, "College students' perceived threat and preference for seeking help in traditional, distributed, and distance learning environments," *Computers & Education*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 383–395, 2007. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360131505000199>
- [11] R. A. Mahasneh, A. K. Sowan, and Y. H. Nassar, "Academic help-seeking in online and face-to-face learning environments," *E-Learning and Digital Media*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 196–210, 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.2304/elea.2012.9.2.196>
- [12] A. W. Chickering and Z. F. Gamson, "Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education," *AAHE bulletin*, vol. 3, p. 7, 1987.
- [13] A. W. Astin, *Achieving educational excellence*. Jossey-Bass, 1985.
- [14] S. L. Dika, "Relations with faculty as social capital for college students: Evidence from puerto rico," *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 596–610, 2012.
- [15] A. M. Delaney, "Why faculty-student interaction matters in the first year experience," *Tertiary Education and Management*, vol. 14, pp. 227–241, 2008.
- [16] J. T. Edwards and L. Helvie-Mason, "Technology and instructional communication: Student usage and perceptions of virtual office hours," *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 174–186, 2010.
- [17] Q. Hao, E. Wright, B. Barnes, and R. M. Branch, "What are the most important predictors of computer science students' online help-seeking behaviors?" *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 62, pp. 467–474, 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563216302874>
- [18] B. Hall, N. Heyl, E. Baniassad, M. Allen, and R. Holmes, "The efficacy of online office hours: An experience report," in *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on SPLASH-E*, ser. SPLASH-E 2021. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021, p. 59–64. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3484272.3484966>
- [19] S.-H. Ko and K. Stephens-Martinez, "What drives students to office hours: individual differences and similarities," in *Proceedings of the 54th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1*, 2023, pp. 959–965.
- [20] K. Michael, "Student perceptions of virtual office hours in a face-to-face undergraduate business course," ser. ICICTE 2013, 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:111017574>
- [21] L. Li and J. P. Pitts, "Does it really matter? using virtual office hours to enhance Student-Faculty interaction," *Journal of Information Systems Education*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 175–186, 2009.
- [22] P. Sankar, J. Gilmartin, and M. Sobel, "An examination of belongingness and confidence among female computer science students," *SIGCAS Comput. Soc.*, vol. 45, no. 2, p. 7–10, jul 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2809957.2809960>
- [23] A. Thinnyun, R. Lenfant, R. Pettit, and J. R. Hott, "Gender and engagement in cs courses on piazza," in *Proceedings of the 52nd ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*, 2021, pp. 438–444.
- [24] R. Lenfant, A. Wanner, J. R. Hott, and R. Pettit, "Project-based and assignment-based courses: A study of piazza engagement and gender in online courses," in *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education V. 1*, 2023, pp. 138–144.
- [25] D. A. Joyner, L. Bernstein, I. Bolger, M.-I. Dittamo, S. Gorham, and R. Hudson, "Anonymity: A double-edged sword for gender equity in a cs1 forum?" in *Proceedings of the 53rd ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education - Volume 1*, ser. SIGCSE 2022. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, p. 766–772. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3478431.3499289>
- [26] M. Sobel, J. Gilmartin, and P. Sankar, "Class size and confidence levels among female stem students [impact]," *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 23–26, 2016.
- [27] R. Ghannam, Q. H. Abbasi, and S. Hussain, "Improving student engagement in a transnational engineering education programme using piazza," Dec 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/203081/>
- [28] S. Yoon, S. Kim, and M. Kang, "Predictive power of grit, professor support for autonomy and learning engagement on perceived achievement within the context of a flipped classroom," *Active Learning in Higher Education*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 233–247, 2020.
- [29] M. Vellukunnel, P. Buffum, K. E. Boyer, J. Forbes, S. Heckman, and K. Mayer-Patel, "Deconstructing the discussion forum: Student questions and computer science learning," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGCSE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*, ser. SIGCSE '17. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, p. 603–608. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3017680.3017745>
- [30] M. Sharma, H. McTavish, Z. Peng, A. Shah, V. Agarwal, C. Sih, E. Hogan, I. V. Molina, A. G. S. Raj, and K. Vaccaro, "Engagement and anonymity in online computer science course forums," 2023.
- [31] H. B. Mann and D. R. Whitney, "On a test of whether one of two random variables is stochastically larger than the other," *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pp. 50–60, 1947.
- [32] J. Cohen, *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Routledge, 2013.
- [33] D. Evenhouse, R. Kandakatl, E. Berger, J. F. Rhoads, and J. DeBoer, "Motivators and barriers in undergraduate mechanical engineering students' use of learning resources," *European Journal of Engineering Education*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 879–899, 2020.
- [34] E. B. Cloude, R. S. Baker, and E. Fouh, "Online help-seeking occurring in multiple computer-mediated conversations affects grades

- in an introductory programming course,” in *LAK23: 13th International Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference*, ser. LAK2023. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, p. 378–387. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3576050.3576106>
- [35] J. L. Hsu, M. Rowland-Goldsmith, and E. B. Schwartz, “Student motivations and barriers toward online and in-person office hours in stem courses,” *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, vol. 21, no. 4, p. ar68, 2022.
- [36] “Women in computer science: Getting involved in stem,” Jun 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.computerscience.org/resources/women-in-computer-science/>